



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 971 e. $\frac{130}{45.9}$





THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

EDITED BY
B. HARRIS COWPER,

EDITOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FROM CODEX A; COMPILER OF A SYRIAC GRAMMAR; TRANSLATOR
OF S. CHRYSOSTOM ON THE PRIESTHOOD; ETC., ETC.

VOL. IX. (NEW SERIES.)



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1866.

LONDON:
MITCHELL AND HUGHES, PRINTERS,
WARDOUR STREET, W.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME IX. (NEW SERIES).

A

Adam, the creation of, 369.
Adultery, the woman taken in, 339, 349.
Æschines quoted, 137.
Ages, literary history of the middle, quoted, 146.
Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes, 410.
Alford, Dean, quoted, 197, 198; on the descent into hell, 102, 104, 105, 107.
Allegories, sacred, 225.
Almanzi collection of Hebrew MSS., 354.
Alphabet on the adaptation of the Roman to foreign languages, 487.
Angel's song, the, 225.
Antiquaries, society of, 409, 503.
Apôtres, Les, 458.
Archæology in Rome, 496.
Artaxerxes, Ahasuerus and, 410.
Asia Central, the religions of, 436; quoted, 436, 437.
Asiatic Royal Society, 498.
Augustine Hymn Book, the, 226.

B

Barker, Mr., and Mr. Gillespie, 214.
Barlow, Mr., his *Eternal Punishment and Eternal Death* referred to, 97.
Bayle quoted, 260, 270.
Beast of the Revelation, the, 228.
Beatitudes, the seven, 230.

Beckman, Dean, referred to, 163; quoted, 164.
Bede, Ven., referred to, 366.
Berington's *Literary History of the Middle Ages* quoted, 146.
Bias, mental, man's responsibility for his, 422.
Bible, Is the, the Word of God? 229; Cranmer's, 248; *Knowledge, the treasury of*, 449; Dictionary, the, 461; a description of the great, 462; revision, 465.
Books received, 233, 453.
Bossuet and R. Simon, 252; quoted, 252.
Boström, Dr., on the Deity, 156; quoted, 158—160, 162, 166.
Buddhists, legends and theories of the, 220.

C

Cain, the death of, 370.
Calendar, the Church, 228.
Cambridge Year Book, the, 228.
Catacombs, discoveries in, 234.
Cautiousness in criticism, the necessity of, 193.
Charnock Stephens, the works of, 230.
Chaucer quoted, 369.
Cheyne, Mr., quoted on Bible revision, 465.
Christianity, organized, 226; and recent speculations, 457; without Judaism, 457; the infancy of, 475.

Chronology of the book of Judges, 217.
 Chrysostom, St. John, on the priesthood, 224.
 Church, the Fathers of the Christian, their works, 246; and the world, 454; essays on the Irish, 455.
 Clarke, Hyde, quoted, 382.
 Commentary, a, on Exodus, 219.
 Conceivable, the, 4 *note*.
 Conception, the word, 4 *note*.
 Contradiction the laws of, 22.
 Coptic papyrus, a, 333.
 Correspondence between Mr. Young and Mr. Gillespie, 383.
 Correspondence on Lev. xi. 3—7, and Deut. xiv. 6—8, 385.
 Cranmer's Bible, 248.
 Crimea, the Karaite MSS. of, 355.
 Criticism, the necessity of cautiousness in, 193.

D

Daguerre, experiments of, 29.
 Dead, the intermediate state of the, 92.
 Dead Sea, Flora of the, 482.
 Decalogue, the, and the Sabbath, 452.
 Dictionary, the Bible, 461.
 Difficulties, Scripture, 219.
 Discourses on special occasions, 222.
 Discoveries in the catacombs, 234.
 Discoveries at Ephesus, 382.

E

"Ecce Homo," two views of, 334; quoted, 340, 342, 343, 348, 350—352; its defects, 341 *et seq.*
 Ecclesiastical year book, the, 456.
 Egyptian, ancient, mode of embalming, 365.
Eirenika, 230.
 Embalming, ancient Egyptian mode of, 365.
 Encyclical, the Pope's, quoted, 145.
 English early religious poetry, 366.
 Enterprizes, missionary, 226.
 Ephesus, discoveries at, 382.
 Essays on the Irish Church, 455.
 Ethnological society, 501.
Etudes sur les Evangiles Apocryphes, 448.
 Exegesis of difficult texts, Acts xxi. 38; Rom. i. 1; iii. 30; iv. 25; vii. 1—4; xi. 13; Ephs. v. 15.
 Exodus, a commentary on, 219.
 Exploration Fund, Palestine, 243.
 Expositions, Sermons and, 223.
 Eusebius of Cæsarea on the star, 117.

F

Fatherhood, the, of God, 453.
 Fathers of the Christian Church, 246.
 Ferrier, Prof., quoted, 18, 26.
 Flora of the Dead Sea, 482.
 Fund, Palestine exploration, 243, 491.

G

Galatians, the Epistle to, 229.
 Genesis, the days of, 435.
Genesis and Exodus, the story of, 367.
 Gillespie, Mr., and Mr. Barker, 214.
 Gillespie and Young, Messrs., correspondence between, 383.
 Gipsies, a history of the, 459.
 God, the necessary existence of, 231; the moral attributes of, 231; the fatherhood of, 453.
 Good, Thomas, the works of, 230.
 Gospels, historical character of, 58, 275.
 Gospel, the, and ritualism, 456.
 Grove, Mr., referred to, 36.

H

Hamilton, Sir William, on the infinite, 21.
 Hampole quoted, 379.
 Hebrew Manuscripts, the Almanzi collection of, 354.
 Hell, the descent into, 100; the articles of Edward the VIth. on, 101; view of commentators on, 101 *note*; Hollaz on, 101; Luther's opinion of, 101; Alford quoted on, 102; Bishop Horsley quoted on, 102.
 Householder, the parable of the, 69.
 Household theology, 220.
 Hupfeld's criticism, 227.
 Hymn book, the Augustine, 226.

I

Identity, the laws of, 22.
 Imagination, 4 *note*.
 Index, the Roman, 464.
 Induction, the canon of, 5; the scheme of, 10; Macaulay on, 17.
 Infancy, the, of Christianity, 475.
 Infinite, the, 7; Sir W. Hamilton on the, 21.

INDEX TO VOLUME IX. (NEW SERIES.)

v

Infinity of space, the, 19.
 Inspiration, 216.
 Inspiration and Revelation, 167.
 Inspiration, the, of Holy Scripture, by
 Archdeacon Lee referred to, 168,
 169, 178.
 Inspiration, theory of, drawn from
 Scripture, 322.
 Institute, the Victoria, 479.
 Irish Church, Essays on the, 455.
 Italy, the awakening of, 231; MSS. in,
 481.

J

Jerusalem, our Lord's entrance into,
 61; prophecy of the destruction of,
 80; a day's ride south from, 474; a
 ride round, 476.
 Jesus, the anointing of, as related in
 the Gospels, 58.
Jesus Christ, E. de Pressensé's, 218.
 Job, difficult passages in, 304.
 John x. 10, 434.
 John Preston, 480.
 Jonah's Prayer, 376.
 Judaism, Christianity without, 457.
 Judges, chronology of the book of, 217.
 Judgments, necessary, 27.
 Just, the resurrection of the, 459.

K

Karaitic MSS. of the Crimea, 355.
 Ker's, Mr., *Immortality and Eternal
 Punishment* referred to, 95; quoted
 on the descent into hell, 103; quoted
 on the return of the ungodly dead,
 115.
 Kitto's Cyclopædia, 451.
Knowledge, the treasury of Bible, 449.
 Koran, Mahomet and the, 439.

L

Lamech, 370.
 Law, the inspiration of, 229; the pro-
 phets and the Psalms, 229.
 Leclerc, Jean, 259.
 Ledien, the Abbé, his diary, 272.
 Lee, Archdeacon, referred to, 168, 170,
 171 *et seq.*; quoted, 169.
 Legends, the, of the Buddhists, 220.
 Liebig, Baron, on chemical investiga-
 tion, 29, 30, 32.
 Life, theology and, 224.

*Ligue de la, De la Démocratie chez les
 Prédicateurs*, 442.
 Literature, specimens of English, 453.
 Literature, Royal Society of, 333.
 Liturgy, the Eastern, 452.
 Logic, Mill's system of, 7.
 Lyra Fidelium, 225.

M

Macaulay quoted, 17.
 Mahomet and the Koran, 439.
 Man, the tripartite nature of, 453.
 Mansel's, Professor, referred to, 4;
 classification of necessary judgments,
 27; quoted, 25, 27.
 Manuscripts, the Almanzi collection of
 Hebrew, 354.
 Manuscripts in Italy, 481.
 Manuscript, the Vatican, 477.
 Maundeville quoted, 369.
 Mede, Joseph, his apostasy of the latter
 times, 116.
 Mental bias, man's responsibility for
 his, 422.
 Messiah, the sonship of the, 7.
Metaphysic Institutes, of, quoted, 18,
 19, 26.
 Mosque of Omar, 503.
 Middle, the laws of, excluded, 22.
 Mill, J. S., and the origin of first prin-
 ciples, 1; system of logic, 7; quoted,
 7; his position as a philosopher, 35.
 Milton quoted, 369.
 Mission, French, to Syria, 483.

N

Names, spelling of Oriental, 353.
 Nebuchadnezzar and his subjects, 180.
 Nephilim, the, 110, and *note*.
 Nineveh, the repentance of, 377.
Notion, the word, 4 *note*.
 Numbers xxv. 9, and 1 Cor. x. 8, 198.

O

Obadiah, a commentary on, 230.
 Omar, the mosque of, 503.
 Oratorians, the French, 249.
 Oriental names, spelling of, 353.

P

Palestine exploration fund, 243, 491.

Pantheism, 315.
 Papyrus, a Coptic, 333.
 Parallelism, New Testament, 205.
 Passover, the last, 200; Jennings referred to on, 201, 202; Lightfoot referred to on, 201.
 Paul, St., 450.
 Pestilence, the, 232.
 Peter, difficult passages in, 98.
 Pharisees, our Lord's dialogue with the, 76.
 Phil. ii. 6, 7, remarks on, 401.
 Philosophy, reconciliation of the two schools of, 1.
 Phrase, the, "*agere pœnitentiam*," 434; "*per Christum Dominum Nostrum*," 435.
 Places, holy, 142.
 Poetry, early English religious, 366.
 Poole, E. S., quoted, 353.
 Prayer, the annotated Book of Common, 460.
 Prayer Book, the interleaved, 222.
 Pressensé, E. de, his *Jesus Christ*, 218.
 Prester, John, 480.
 Priesthood, St. John Chrysostom on the, 224.
 Principles, inductive origin of first, 1.
 Prophets, the Hebrew, 450.
 Protestantism in Scandinavia, 143; a history of, 150.
 Purgatory, Biblical arguments in favour of, 96; the Roman Catholic doctrine of, 96, 100; Council of Trent on, 100.

Q

Quiver, the, quoted, 401.

R

Reformation the true road to Unity, 228.
 Reid, Hamilton's, quoted, 4 *note*.
 Religion, thoughts on personal, 223.
 Religious poetry, early English, 366.
 Remarks on Phil. ii. 6, 7, 401.
 Repentance of Nineveh, the, 377.
 Responsibility, man's, for his mental bias, 422.
 Resurrection, our Lord's dialogue with the Sadducees on, 74; the fourfold narrative of the, 275; events following the, 303; of our Lord, 433; Alford quoted on, 433; of the just, 459.
 Revelation, the beast of the, 228.

Revelation and inspiration, 167.
 Revision, Bible, 465; Cheyne, Mr., on, 465.
 Ride, a, round Jerusalem, 470; a day's south from Jerusalem, 474.
 Righteous, the names of the place where admitted after death, 94 *note*.
 Ritualism and the gospel, 456.
 Robinson, Dr., quoted, 49.
 Roman index, the, 464.
 Rome, the crisis of, 231; reunion with, 457; archaeology in, 496.
 Rosetta stone, another, 479.
 Russell, Mr. Odo, a dispatch of, 150.

S

Sabbath, the, and the decalogue, 452.
 Sabbath, the observance of the, 458.
 Sacred allegories, 225.
 Sacrifice, the, of the death of Christ, 221; the vicarious, 221.
 Sadducees, our Lord's dialogue with the, on the resurrection, 74.
 Samuel, the appearance of, to Saul, 114.
 Scandinavia, Protestantism in, 143.
 Science and Christian thought, 225.
 Scripture difficulties, 219; theory of inspiration drawn from the, 322.
 Sepulchre, the holy, 409.
 Sermons and expositions, 223.
 Sesostris, the monument of, 501.
 Siddim, the vale of, 46.
 Simon, Richard, 249; Spanheim quoted on, 250; Bossuet and, 252; his *Histoire Critique*, 256; quoted, 263, 266, 267; on inspiration, 264.
 Simon, Saint, quoted, 271.
 Site of the holy sepulchre, 409.
 Site of Sodom and Gomorrah, 36.
 Smith, Dr. Payne, a sermon by, 233.
 Society, Royal, of Literature, 338; of Antiquaries, 409, 503; Royal Asiatic, 498; Ethnological, 501; Syro-Egyptian, 501.
 Sodom and Gomorrah, statements of ancient writers concerning, 5; site of, 36; Eusebius, 54; Jerome, 54; Josephus, 54; names given to, by Arabs, 55; Mediæval travellers, Brocardus and Fulcher, 54, 55.
 Song, the Angel's, 225.
 Space, the infinity of, 19.
 Spanheim quoted, 250.
 Spencer, Mr. Herbert, quoted, 1, 3.
 Star, the, Eusebius on, 117.
 State, the intermediate, of the dead, 92.
 Stone, another Rosetta, 479.

Suicides, the per centage of, in various countries, 163 *note*.
 Supposable, the, 4 *note*.
 Swedenborg and his critics, 227.
 Syria, French Mission to, 483.
 Syro-Egyptian Society, 501.
 Syrus, Ephraem, quoted, 377 *note*.

T

Temple, the spiritual, 231.
 Tennyson quoted, 348.
 Texts, exegesis of difficult, 137.
 Thenius on the witch of Endor, 114.
 Theology, household, 220.
 Theology and life, 224.
 Theory of inspiration drawn from Scripture, 322.
 Thought, science and Christian, 225.
 Thoughts on personal religion, 223.
 Timothy, epistles to, on the meaning of various passages in, 426.
 Trent, the Council of, on purgatory, 100.
 Tribute, the lawfulness of, as related in the Gospels, 73.
 Tristram, Mr., referred to, 36; quoted, 51.
 Truth, necessary, 5.

U

Ulphilas referred to, 366.
 Unity, visible, 232.
 Universalization, the law of, 5.

V

Vatican manuscript, the, 477.
 Vestments, the sacrificial, 456.
 Vicarious sacrifice, the, 221.
 Victoria institute, the, 479.
 Views of "Ecce Homo," two, 334.
 Visible unity, 232.

W

Walchius quoted, 259, 268.
 Wiclif referred to, 366; translation quoted, 381.
 Woman, the, taken in adultery, 339, 349.
 World, Christian, light of the, 223.
 World, the Church and the, 454.
 Worship, free and open, 223.

Y

Young and Gillespie, Messrs., correspondence between, 383.



THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

~~~~~  
No. XVII.—APRIL, 1866.  
~~~~~

MR. J. S. MILL AND THE INDUCTIVE ORIGIN OF FIRST PRINCIPLES.

A STEP TOWARDS THE RECONCILIATION OF THE TWO SCHOOLS OF PHILOSOPHY.

THAT it is of the highest importance to ascertain the true and infallible method of obtaining first principles, more especially in those departments of knowledge which are aiming to be sciences, but have as yet their first principles in an unsettled condition, will be readily acknowledged by every one who is keenly alive to the influence which ideas exert upon the progress of the human race.

To describe this method in a general way, and in relation to the views of some of the leading writers on this subject in this country, is the object of this essay.

Mr. Herbert Spencer, in criticizing Mr. J. S. Mill's views in relation to Dr. Whewell's test of necessary truth, remarks that,—

“If there be, as Mr. J. S. Mill holds, certain absolute uniformities in nature; if these absolute uniformities produce, as they must, absolute uniformities in our experience; and if, as he shews, these absolute uniformities in our experience disable us from conceiving the negation of them, then answering to each absolute uniformity in nature which we can cognize there must be in us a belief of which the negation is inconceivable, and which is absolutely true. . . . In nearly all cases this test of inconceivableness must be valid now, and where it is not, it still expresses the

net result of our experience up to the present time, which is the most that any test can do.”^a

Mr. Spencer holds, then, that what is contrary to absolute or unbroken uniformity of experience is inconceivable, and that this is the only test of the invariableness of a belief. Is a belief invariable? We know that it is so by the inconceivableness of its negation, by its firmly holding its ground against every possible attempt to upset it. But why is its negation inconceivable? Because the negation is completely opposed to our uniform and unbroken experience. But is this test absolutely perfect? Is it possible that a belief pronounced by it to be invariable should some time or other turn out to be variable? Mr. Spencer, in words which are quoted below, seems to admit that the test does not always preclude this possibility. Indeed, how can uniform experience, for example, our experience of the sun’s rising, prove the impossibility of the cessation of this event? No induction from such experience is competent to establish a necessary and universal truth, and it is only the negation of such a truth which is absolutely inconceivable. Uniform experience supplies us with two kinds of convictions, those whose negation *is* conceivable, and those whose negation is *not* conceivable. But why is there this difference between them? Philosophy will not rest satisfied with the simple statement of the fact that some beliefs, when you attempt to dispel them by any means whatever, are discovered to be perfectly indestructible, but will seek to dive deeper into the matter, and look out for some explanation of this fact.

In the controversy between Mr. Mill and Dr. Whewell (alas! now no more), in regard to inconceivableness as the test of necessary truth, it is contended by the former, owing to what, in imitation of Reid, may be called an *error personæ*, that certain beliefs were once held to be true, because their negation in some sense was inconceivable, which beliefs are now exploded, and, therefore, that such inconceivableness is no infallible criterion of the necessity of a truth. But the inconceivableness which Dr. Whewell had in view is that which we experience when we try to think the contradictory of a necessary truth, as, for instance, that $5 + 5$ does not make 10. The inconceivableness which Mr. Mill has singled out is that which certain persons have felt when they attempted to undo firm, long-standing, but ill-founded associations. Mr. Spencer attempts to weaken the force of Mr. Mill’s objection to Dr. Whewell’s view, but does not perceive its irrelevant character. He writes:—

^a *Principles of Psychology*, Introduction, p. 21.

"Conceding the entire truth of Mr. Mill's position, that as during any phase of human progress, the ability or inability to form a specific conception wholly depends on the experiences men have had, they may by-and-bye be enabled to conceive things before inconceivable to them; it may still be argued that as, at any time, the best warrant men can have for a belief is the perfect agreement of all pre-existing experience in support of it, it follows that, at any time, the inconceivableness of its negation is the deepest test any belief admits of. Though occasionally it may prove an imperfect test, yet as our most certain beliefs are capable of no better, to doubt one belief, because we have no higher guarantee for it, is really to doubt all beliefs."^b

By inconceivableness, then, Mr. Spencer means much the same thing as Mr. Mill does, namely,—that which is contrary to absolute or steadfast uniformity of experience. While, however, Mr. Mill, in opposition to Dr. Whewell, makes little of the test of inconceivableness, and exposes its weakness, Mr. Spencer makes the most of it; maintaining that our most certain beliefs are capable of no better. We think that Mr. Spencer is right in the main. Truths are known to be necessary and universal by its being found that they will not brook contradiction. For example, we know that $5 + 5$ must always make 10, because it is impossible to conceive or even to suppose $5 + 5$ making anything else than 10. So far we agree with Mr. Spencer; but we cannot hold with him that absolute uniformities in our experience are the sole root of convictions whose negation is inconceivable from involving contradiction, because uniform experience supplies us with some convictions whose negation is *not* inconceivable from involving contradiction, as, for example, our belief in the future rising of the sun or the alternations of day and night.

How can Mr. Spencer account for the existence of the absolutely fixed conviction that $2 + 2$ can by no possibility whatever make, at any time, anything else than 4? If we simply had the evidence of invariable experience for the truth of this conviction, we should have only precisely the same evidence for it as we have for the belief that the sun will continue to rise in future. But surely, if, from this evidence, we cannot infer that the sun will never cease to rise; neither can we conclude from similar evidence that $2 + 2$ will never cease to make 4. We cannot, from precisely similar inductions, infer a contingent truth, as well as a necessary and universal truth. No; we can only draw, in both instances, the weaker conclusion which follows in one of them. Since, however, our conviction that $2 + 2$ must always make 4, is as strong as it can possibly be, it must be

^b Introduction, p. 21.

quite clear that it is based on far more conclusive evidence than that which has here been claimed for it.

It is pointed out by Mr. Mill, that in some cases we have not the power, from the absence of any analogy, to imagine an exception to our uniform experience. We cannot, for example, imagine space which has no space beyond; time which had no time prior to it, or which will have no time posterior to it; or picture the character of elements simpler than those which baffle the attempts of analysis to resolve them into yet simpler ones.^c In these instances the inconceivableness arises, not from involving contradiction, but from restrictions of another kind to which the mind is subject. This species of inconceivableness is brought by Professor Mansel under the head of judgments necessary in the second degree, or psychological necessity.^d The contradictory of such judgments is said to be supposable, but not conceivable,^e that is, there is nothing to prove that the contradictory may not be true; but we are not able, for want of material, for want of elements, to form either a notion or a mental image of it. For example, we cannot form a mental picture of space which has no space beyond. Admitting that the mind is subject to these restrictions; still, if we have the evidence of uniform experience alone for the infinity of space, we are not deterred by that evidence from supposing space to be finite, even though we cannot conceive or picture it as such.

^c *System of Logic*. Third Edition. Vol. i., p. 268.

^d *Prolegomena Logica*. Second Edition, p. 176.

^e By the supposable, but not conceivable, we must understand that which may be, for aught we know to the contrary, but of which we have not the means of forming a notion or concept. Thus, we can suppose a being capable of perceiving colours without eyes; but how this is done it is not in our power either to conceive or imagine.

"The words *Conception*, *Concept*, *Notion*, should be limited to the thought of what cannot be represented in the imagination, as the thought suggested by a general term. The Leibnitzians call this *symbolical* in contrast to *intuitive* knowledge. This is the sense in which *conceptio* and *conceptus* have been usually and correctly employed. Mr. Stewart, on the other hand, arbitrarily limits conception to the reproduction (in imagination) of an object of sense as actually perceived." (*Hamilton's Reid*, p. 360. Note.)

Adopting the interpretation here given, we define the following terms thus:—

Perception, the mental act by which we have direct, presentative, or intuitive knowledge of individual objects as individual. This mental act is otherwise called the Law of Difference.

Conception (*con-cipere*), the mental act by which, in the first place, we have a knowledge of individual objects as resembling each other; in the second place, by which we form notions or concepts, and express them by general terms; and in the third place, by which we attach a meaning to general terms. This mental act is otherwise called the Law of Similarity.

Imagination, the mental act by which we re-present in thought the presentations of perception either as they actually occur, or not as they actually occur, but combined in a fictitious manner.

The undoubted fact, however, that we cannot even suppose space to be finite, without a falling into contradiction, manifestly shews that absolute uniformity of experience is not the sole basis of the conviction that space is illimitable.

Having thus opened the question, let us proceed to examine the origin of necessary and universal truth. After long and patient investigation, we have arrived at the conviction that necessary truth is procured by a form of reasoning which, as preliminary to further inquiry, and as a help to it, may be expressed as follows:—If it is *perceived* that *this* is connected with *that*, and if it is also *perceived* that *this* without *that* cannot exist, then it is *inferred* that *this* is necessarily connected with *that*.

We call this the Canon of Induction. Be it observed that it is a form of reasoning. We have in it a positive and a negative premiss, and a conclusion which states the inference drawn from them. For example, perception enables us simply to ascertain that $2+2$ makes 4, and that without $2+2$ there is no 4. But when perception has done this, there is no more that it can do. It is by an act of reasoning, by the comparison of the above data, that we are enabled to get a knowledge of the necessary conjunction which exists between $2+2$ and 4. The above canon seems therefore to be the criterion of necessary truth. According to it, there is no alternative save for a connection among facts, whether belonging to the mental or the physical world, to be either necessary or not necessary, that is, contingent.

It has, however, always been held that a necessary truth is virtually a universal truth. Now it appears that the universality of a necessary truth is inferred from the fact that its contradictory cannot be entertained by the mind. For example, if it is proved by inductive reasoning that a triangle is necessarily three-sided, we cannot suppose an instance in which this is not the case, or in which a triangle is not three-sided, without committing a *subversio principii*, without destroying, that is, the very subject of the contradictory judgment itself, and this because the subject necessarily implies the judgment to which the contradictory is opposed, namely, that a triangle is necessarily three-sided. If it is proved that $2+2$ must equal 4, then, when by an effort of conception we multiply cases of $2+2=4$, if we would not subvert our *principium*, we are compelled to suppose each case as precisely similar to it. It is by adopting this plan alone that we are able to avoid falling into contradiction. The only alternative which we have, therefore, is to infer that at any period, past, present, and to come, and in any number of instances, a necessary conjunction is a universal one. This law we have named—The Law of Universalization.

To the united operation of inductive reasoning and the Law of Universalization we trace the origin of all necessary and universal truth. Before proceeding further, however, with this examination, it becomes necessary to draw attention to a serious cause of ambiguity and controversy in the language pertaining to the question before us.

Some have thought, that there is no sufficient ground for making that distinction between necessary truth and contingent which the *à priori* school insists upon so strongly. What is really meant by these designations? Any truth, if it be in reality what it professes to be, is necessarily true. To say that a truth is contingently true implies that it may be untrue, that it is open to doubt. This, however, is not what is commonly understood by a contingent truth. Contingency is not usually used as a synonym for probability, because many a contingent truth is true beyond all doubt, is indeed necessarily true. For instance, it is as incontestably true that a man's hands are in his pockets while they are there, as it is that a whole is greater than its part, and the former of these we call a contingent truth. What, therefore, is the precise meaning to be attached to the terms, necessary truth and contingent? By a necessary truth must be understood a necessary connection between one thing and another, and by a contingent truth a conjunction which is not necessary, that is, contingent. It would, consequently, be more correct to name a necessary truth or a contingent, a necessary or a contingent conjunction, connection, or concatenation. The necessity and the contingency do not express the character of the cognition which a truth implies, but the character of that which is cognized.

When by inductive reasoning according to the Canon, a conjunction is proved to be not necessary, it is contingent. Necessity and contingency are consequently related terms. Not necessary means contingent, and not contingent means necessary. The whole universe of conjunctions among things is exhausted by these two terms. It is, therefore, a cardinal law of being, that every conjunction between one thing and another is either necessary or contingent.

Having now shewn that by necessary truth is meant necessary conjunction, that such conjunction is ascertained by inductive reasoning according to the Canon, and is known to be universal by the Law of Universalization, we shall in the next place proceed to examine the relation in which the system here announced stands to that of Mr. J. S. Mill.

II. That the general must be derived from the particular must be evident to every one who has read, with the care which it de-

serves, Mr. Mill's masterly work, *The System of Logic*. All our presentative and all our representative knowledge, all that we perceive, all that we conceive, and all that we imagine, must be particular or within limit. A necessary and universal proposition is, however, infinite in extension. Of the infinite man cannot possibly have direct, intuitive, or presentative knowledge. For instance, time is an indispensable condition of man's knowing, and at any one time he can only be presentatively cognizant, for example, of a finite portion of space. To know space as infinite, therefore, by an accumulation of presentative cognitions of finite portions, is impossible, because this would require an infinite period of time. If a man were to live a million years, and during the whole of that time were to keep on thinking of space beyond space, he would still find space beyond the furthest point to which he had reached. We know the infinite, therefore, as will be shewn in the sequel, inferentially and negatively, namely, by universalizing from our knowledge of necessary conjunction, in accordance with the method described above. Mr. Mill, however, contends very strenuously against Dr. Whewell, that the so-called necessary truths have not, as a distinct class, any existence. The source of these truths, he maintains, is association.

"When we have often seen and thought of two things together, and have never, in any one instance, either seen or thought of them separately, there is, by the primary law of association, an increasing difficulty, which may in the end become insuperable, of conceiving the two things apart."^f

"If daily habit presents to any one, for a long period, two facts in combination; and if he is not led during that period, either by accident or by his voluntary mental operations, to think of them apart, he will probably, in time, become incapable of doing so, even by the strongest effort; and the supposition that the two facts can be separated in nature will at last present itself to the mind with all the characters of an inconceivable phenomenon."^g

"If then it be so natural to the human mind, even in a high state of culture, to be incapable of conceiving, and on that ground to believe impossible what is afterwards not only found to be conceivable, but proved to be true, what wonder, if in cases where the association is still older, more confirmed, and more familiar, and in which nothing ever occurs to shake our conviction, or even to suggest to us any conception at variance with the association, the acquired incapacity should continue, and be mistaken for a natural incapacity?"^a

Now, in such cases it is impossible to deny to association all the force which Mr. Mill claims for it; but we contend that association is not sufficient to account for the actually proved

^f *System of Logic*, vol., i, p. 265.

^g *Ibid.*, p. 266.

^a *Ibid.*, p. 267.

inconceivableness of the negation of recently ascertained instances of necessary conjunction. For let it be clearly understood, that we are not simply ignorant as to whether the negation of a necessary conjunction be true or false, but that we have full proof of its falsehood; of this, however, more by-and-bye. Mr. Mill, when treating of association, necessarily makes use of the following expressions, "long established and familiar experience," "old familiar habits of thought," "when we have often seen and thought of two things together," "in cases in which the association is still older, more confirmed and more familiar," "a sufficient repetition of the process." Now, all these expressions imply that it is not possible to have the notion of a necessary conjunction between things without repetition, and a very considerable lapse of time. But this is not true. From a *single* instance of inductive reasoning according to the Canon, a necessary conjunction can be inferred, and this can be legitimately extended to a universal conjunction. Even in early youth, before long-continued and familiar experience can be gained, we feel confident that there is a necessary connection between $2+3$ and 5 . The youth knows this simple fact by the spontaneous and undetected operation of his faculties in accordance with the laws described above. For instance, by perception we know that $2+2=4$, and by perception we know that without $2+2$ there is no 4 , but it is by inductive reasoning alone we conclude from these data, and cannot avoid concluding, that $2+2$ must make 4 . Now we maintain that truths thus ascertained do not depend on association for their necessity, but are known to be necessary conjunctions by reasoning; and that their necessity is as evident the first time it is fully realized, as it is at any subsequent period; and that the incapacity for conceiving the contradictory of them to be true is not "acquired," but "natural."

In view of the undeviating uniformity with which some conjunctions occur, in view of cases in which, as Mr. Mill remarks, "nothing ever occurs to shake our conviction, or even to suggest to us any conception at variance with the association," by which we think of two things as united, the *à posteriori* school maintains that there is no occasion for seeking a firmer basis for our belief in the avowed necessity and universality of certain conjunctions. But wherein does the uniform experience differ which leads us positively to declare that two straight lines can never enclose space, from the uniform experience which only leads to the belief that the sun will continue to rise in future? We grant that, in the former example, nothing ever occurs even to suggest to us a conception at variance with the association which has been formed in our minds, and that in the latter example, events *do*

occur which suggest to us that the sun may some time cease to arise. Now, we hold that when this difference in the experience is thoroughly analyzed, and reduced to system, it comes to what we have propounded above. Mr. Mill, however, in his reduction of the same difference to system, arrives at a result which has much in common with our own, but is also distinguished from it in some very essential points.

According to the Canon of inductive reasoning, inference commences with the establishment of individual or isolated cases of necessary conjunction. Inference from a conclusion thus derived to a similar case, or a number of similar cases, involves the operation of the conceptive or generalizing faculty, but this inference is not guaranteed, unless every possible case is guaranteed, unless the possibility of an exception is most completely excluded, and this result is not secured except by universalization from an instance of necessary conjunction. Particulars can only with complete validity be derived from particulars, when the latter are instances of necessary conjunction warranting us to draw from them a universal conclusion. The particular is derivable, because the universal is; but the universal is not derived by the particulars which it embraces having been beforehand severally educed in detail, because the universal, being infinite in extension, could never by this step-by-step fashion be reached. At one step, as described in the Law of Universalization, we draw a conclusion which denotes, or contains in its extension, every possible case, but we cannot present to the mind every individual case contained in this universal, in its exclusion from every other case. The universal being infinite in extension, we can no more exhaust its infinity by a serial picturing in imagination of the individuals which it contains, than we can by a similar procedure exhaust the infinity of space. The universal is known inferentially and negatively; but cannot be known, except in part, either presentatively in perception, or representatively in imagination, and conception.

Having thus prepared the way for an examination of Mr. Mill's views, we shall now proceed to ask where inference or reasoning commences in his system. Mr. Mill emphatically insists that all inference is essentially from particulars to particulars without the intervention of general propositions, and that the procession from particulars to generals is not an indispensable part of the reasoning process.¹ Coupling this view with his denial of the existence of such a distinctive class of truths as the so-called necessary, his inductive system differs

¹ *System of Logic*, vol. i., book ii., chap. iiii.

materially in these respects from that propounded above. The function which inductive reasoning according to the Canon is assigned in this essay is, by Mr. Mill, exclusively allotted to observation and experiment, that is, to mental operations which are presupposed by reasoning. Having either by observation or experiment ascertained particular instances of unconditional antecedence and consequence, reasoning, according to Mr. Mill, commences when we begin to generalize from these instances, and the only real inference is generalization from particulars to particulars. To reason from particulars to generals is only an extension of the same process, differing nothing from it in kind, and possessing no superior authority whatever over it in cogency. We dissent from Mr. Mill's views on these points. We believe that reasoning begins with the establishment of necessary conjunction among individual facts, a kind of conjunction which Mr. Mill endeavours to account for by association alone; that there is a further inference from a case of necessary conjunction to universal conjunction; that we are only warranted in concluding with certainty from particulars to particulars when we can do so without the possibility of stumbling upon an exception to our conclusion; and that this can only be when we are able to educe the universal from the particular, because the former embraces every possible case.

Mr. Mill has embodied his scheme of induction in five canons expressive of the Method of Agreement, the Method of Difference, the Indirect Method of Difference, the Method of Residues, and the Method of Concomitant Variations. Mr. Mill allows that the most stringent method is that of Difference. Indeed, this is the only one which complies with the requirements of the Canon of Induction as given above. The other methods are only conclusive in so far as they observe the conditions of complete inductive reasoning, in a more or less indirect manner. Now let us examine Mr. Mill's version of the Method of Difference, and we shall discover that in so far as we establish truth by it, we do so by reasoning, and not simply by observation and experiment.

If $A B C$ is followed by $a b c$, and all other circumstances remaining the same with the exception of A ,— $B C$ is followed by $b c$, it is by reasoning we conclude that A is the cause of a . The two premisses are $A B C a b c$, $B C b c$, and it is by the comparison of these that we infer that A is the cause of a . We prefer stating this form of reasoning as isolated from every circumstance which is not essential to it. Mr. Mill exhibits it as existing with unessential concomitants. When isolated from these it appears thus:—

| | | | |
|----|---|----------|---|
| " | A | " | a |
| No | A | no | a |
| ∴ | A | cause of | a |

If we compare instances of $A B C a b c$ and $B C b c$ with instances of $A B C a b c$ and $B C a b c$, we must acknowledge that, in the former example, there is a kind of connection established between A and a which is quite different from that found to exist in the latter example between A and a . In $A B C a b c$, $B C b c$, we find that a is dependent on the presence of A ; but in $A B C a b c B C a b c$, we find that a is *not* dependent on the presence of A . We have chosen to call the connection between A and a , in the former example, a necessary one, but in the latter, a contingent one. The two kinds of connection are essentially distinct from each other, and it is indispensably necessary to yield to this fact a more complete recognition than is commonly done.

Uniform conjunctions of facts, to which exceptions have never been witnessed, but exceptions to which are easily conceivable from analogies suggestive of them, are contingent conjunctions. Thus, although the sun has never, within the memory of man, been extinguished, still we cannot regard this as impossible, because the quenching of luminous bodies is perfectly familiar to us. In such cases, the negative condition of valid inductive reasoning is not complied with so as to prove necessary conjunction, but rather the reverse. If there are no analogies suggestive of exceptions to uniform conjunctions of facts, and still the negative condition of inductive argument cannot be established, the conjunctions must be pronounced to be unascertained ones. Let us now proceed to a more minute analysis of inductive reasoning.

III. It has been shewn that there are two kinds of conjunction among things, namely, necessary and contingent, and that these exhaust the universe of conjunctions as existing among objects. It is also to be noticed that a thing is connected as to time in three distinct relations to other things; it may either precede, co-exist with, or follow them. These relations are summed up as co-existences, and as antecedents and consequents.

It will make this subject more intelligible if we, in the first place, examine necessary conjunction and contingent as they exist in nature, namely, as individual facts, not indeed that the mind ever thus exclusively regards them, but it has the power to do so, because the category of difference is prior in logical order to that of resemblance. Actual objects are indeed individual, consequently they must be cognized in their individual or mutually excluding character as the very con-

dition of apprehending them as members of wholes or concepts which the mind, in consequence of the resemblance which individual objects bear to each other, frames for the sake of greater facility of thought and expression. And this mode of regarding objects in their individual character is more especially justified when a much clearer understanding of the subject under inquiry promises to be the result.

In the first place, therefore, let us proceed to examine necessary conjunction and contingent as subsisting among co-existences, or wholes and their attributes.

A conjunction is known to be necessary between a whole and its attributes by an inductive argument of the following description:—A whole possesses certain parts, without these parts it ceases to exist; therefore they are necessary or essential parts. A conjunction is known to be contingent between a whole and certain parts in the following manner:—A whole has certain qualities attached to it, but does not cease to exist when any of these are absent, therefore these qualities are contingent ones or accidents.

It is not unimportant to remark that, even in the case of individual objects, the necessity or contingency of the qualities of any whole are, in one respect, that of the observer, relative to the view taken of the comprehension of the whole. If the whole be regarded as the synthesis of every possible circumstance connected with it, then all its qualities will be regarded as necessary to it. If, however, the individual whole be looked upon as the synthesis only of its fundamental and abiding attributes, all other things predicable of it will be reckoned as contingent or accidental. This latter is the mode in which the mind usually contemplates an individual or concrete whole, regarding all that is commonly separable from it as contingently attached to it. Thus, certain qualities are essential to this pen; it could not be the pen which it is without them. But to be held in the hand; to be with or without ink; to be in this or that place; to be used for writing either a letter, an essay, or a poem, these we consider as accidents. It is quite possible, however, to take such a view of an individual whole as that its accidents may become essential qualities. For instance, according to the usual mode of regarding swans, whiteness is not considered an essential quality; but if we look upon an individual swan as the synthesis of all its qualities, then whiteness will be an essential part of that synthesis. If we look upon the word snow as connoting whiteness, whiteness is thereby made a necessary attribute of the notion, snow. If this man is contemplated as a man-sitting, sitting then forms part of the *principium*, and therefore cannot be absent without destroying the *principium*.

We have in the next place to examine necessary conjunction and contingent among individual cases of antecedence and consequence. These kinds of conjunction are discovered in accordance with the following inductive arguments:—When this event follows that event, and cannot follow without the antecedence of that, this event follows necessarily from the antecedence of that. But if this event follows that event, and continues to occur when that does not precede it, then this event only contingently follows that.

As a description, however, of a case of causation, simply to say that one event is consequent upon another, is too vague and general a description to procure from it an exact formula of the reasoning involved. The simplest adequate description of a case of causation is the following:—If on the conjunction of two or more objects, a change takes place in either or all of them, and if when this conjunction does not take place, no such change follows, then the two or more objects in a state of union with each other are necessary to the change. The exact formula of inductive reasoning for establishing necessary conjunction of antecedent and consequent is, therefore, the following:—

If A and B when joined together are followed by a change in one or both,

And if when A and B are not joined together, there is no such change,

Then, A and B in a state of union are necessary to the change.

An individual instance of causation cannot of course occur if any of the elements which are essential to it be eliminated. Our reason for making this statement shall appear when causation has to be considered as a general fact.

We have next to examine necessary conjunction and contingent as general facts, or in the whole of extension, and first in relation to co-existences, or wholes and their attributes.

If we bring several wholes, in so far as they resemble each other, under the same denomination, this necessitates the abstraction of attention from those parts in which they differ. The parts thus disregarded are looked upon as contingently related to the general whole, notion, or concept thus formed. If again we compare this general whole with other general wholes, and so far as they resemble each other give them a common name, their differences will be reckoned as accidents to the concept thus formed. It is thus seen that the necessary attributes of a more comprehensive class become the contingent qualities of a less comprehensive, or more extensive, class. That

which is necessary to the class—equilateral triangle, is contingent to the larger class—triangle.

It is necessary here to remark, that qualities which are accidents to a general whole, which, for the sake of greater simplicity and order, we constitute for ourselves, are not, in consequence, accidents to the individual objects from which, on account of their resemblance to each other, we derive this whole. These qualities are contingently related to the concept in this sense; only some or other of them need be thought of when the concept is presented to the mind. If, for example, we call up a vivid notion of a triangle, we shall be constrained to think of its essential attributes, together with some or other of its accidents. It must be of some form or other, of some size or other, and in some place or other. In regard to necessary attributes, we have no alternative but to think of them as invariable. In regard to accidents, we are not placed under such a restriction. We have not the option, however, of thinking of none of them, because no individual object exists without some or other of them; and if truth be our aim, we must think of things as they really exist, and not frame arbitrary notions concerning them. It is true that when we form concepts, we possess correct notions of objects up to a certain point—that is, in so far as all such objects resemble each other. Concepts, therefore, only partially represent the things from which they are derived. If we would fully describe a given object, we must add to the concept which embraces it some or other of those qualities which have been necessarily kept out of view in order to the formation of the concept. And even if we would have a vivid notion of a class of things, we cannot do so without picturing one of its units, or a series of them, in the investiture of some or other of their accidental qualities, because no object can either exist, or be imagined to exist, entirely denuded of these. If we would have a precise notion of the class, triangle, we shall be bound to fix upon a given triangle, or a series of given triangles, invested with definite form, size, and locality, and understand that these triangles in their essential attributes represent the class, but do not do so in their variable attributes. Ordinarily, however, we merely use the *name* of a class without calling up an exact notion of what it expresses. We use words as we use bank-notes—payable on demand, without always making the demand. When, however, this demand is made, we must, in order to give our concept a representative existence in imagination, recall some or other of those variable qualities which are factitiously reckoned as extraneous to it.

We have next to examine causation as a general fact. In-

stances of causation, in so far as they resemble each other, are reducible into classes, and some qualities that are indispensable to individual instances of causation are then bound to be regarded as contingent to the factitious general whole which is thus formed. For example, suppose that a certain death is caused by a stab with a certain instrument, by a certain person, in a certain vital part of the body. Now, to this individual case of death, every one of the particulars here mentioned is necessary. But if we form a general notion of death caused by stabbing, we by that act are constrained to relegate to the category of accidents the notion of a certain instrument, a certain person, and a certain vital part of the body. When Professor Mansel makes use of the words, "admitting that causation means no more than immediate antecedence in time, it is obviously one thing to say that every event must have some antecedent or other, and (which he denies) another to say that this particular event must always have this particular antecedent,"^j—he must mean by "particular event," not an individual event, but a particular class of events, as, for instance, death by stabbing. Of a given class of events, of course, we can only truly declare that will have a certain *class* of antecedents. Having formed a general notion of the events, by overlooking their points of difference, we must also form a general notion of their antecedents by a similar disregard of differences. This is just what Professor Mansel's words amount to, for, undoubtedly, an individual event can only have individual antecedents, and exact reproductions of this event involve exact reproductions of its antecedents.

We are now in a position to see that much of what is necessary to individual objects as they really exist, and to individual instances of causation as they actually occur, is to a certain extent reckoned as not necessary, or as accidental, to a *class* of objects, or to a *class* of causes and effects; and that much of that which is recognized as necessary to a more comprehensive class is looked upon as contingently related to a more extensive one embracing the former.

IV. The form of inductive reasoning announced in the preceding pages, implies the following rules.

In relation to the positive premiss of the canon we have these two rules:—

1. If the existence of one thing is *not* uniformly attendant upon the existence of another thing, it is not necessary to the existence of that other.

2. If the existence of one thing *is* uniformly attendant upon

^j *Prolegomena Logica*. Second Edition, p. 148.

the existence of another thing, it may possibly be necessary to the existence of that other.

In relation to the comparison of the positive and negative premisses with each other, we have these two rules :—

3. The medium through which the positive and negative premisses of an inductive argument are compared must be strictly one, or equivalent to it.

4. The next approach to one medium of comparison is when the premisses are compared through two media which exactly resemble each other.

In relation to the negative premiss, we have these two rules :—

5. If the non-existence of a thing is *not* uniformly attendant upon the non-existence of another thing, the existence of the former is not necessary to that of the latter.

6. If the non-existence of a thing *is* uniformly attendant upon the non-existence of another thing, the existence of the former may possibly be necessary to that of the latter.

Let us now briefly apply these rules. The following is an invalid argument, because, according to rule 2, we can only draw a probable conclusion. This, that, and the other country prosper, and they have protective duties, therefore their prosperity is owing to the existence of protective duties. The next is an invalid argument, because neither rule 3 nor yet rule 4 is complied with. This country prospers and has protective duties, that country does not prosper, and has no protective duties, therefore this country prospers, because it has protective duties. In this argument the two media of comparison are not, as demanded by rule 4, exactly similar in every respect, with the exception of the absence and the presence of protective duties. The attempt to establish this similarity would very soon expose the fallacy. Suppose we now proceed to examine, by the light of these rules, the reasoning, as described by Macaulay, of the facetious judge “who was in the habit of jocosely propounding, after dinner, a theory, that the cause of the prevalence of Jacobinism was the practice of bearing three names. He quoted on the one side, Charles James Fox, Richard Brinsley Sheridan, John Horne Tooke, John Philpot Curran, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Theobald Wolfe Tone. These were *instantiæ convenientes*. He then proceeded to cite instances *absentiæ in proximo*—William Pitt, John Scott, William Wyndham, Samuel Horsely, Henry Dundas, Edmund Burke.”* We need not conclude the argument, but shall proceed to shew that the *instantiæ convenientes* are not exhaustive, and, therefore, do not comply with rule 2,

* *Essay on Bacon.*

which requires that the practice of bearing three names should be uniformly attendant upon the holding of Jacobinism, which of course is not the case. In like manner, the instances *absentiæ in proximo* do not comply with rule 6, which requires that the practice of bearing two names, that is, of not having three names, should be uniformly attendant upon the rejection of the above-mentioned doctrine, which is also far from being the case. But if the possession of three names is not uniformly attendant upon the holding of Jacobinism, then, by rule 1, it is not necessary to the existence of the same. Rule 5 can in like manner be applied to disprove the statement that having two names involved the renunciation of Jacobinism.

Now, if it were not competent for us to take any further view of this jocose argument, Macaulay would be right when he says:

"Here is an induction corresponding with Bacon's analysis, and ending in a monstrous absurdity. In what then does this induction differ from the induction which leads us to the conclusion that the presence of the sun is the cause of our having more light by day than by night? The difference evidently is not in the kind of instances, but in the number of instances; that is to say, the difference is not in that part of the process for which Bacon has given precise rules, but in a circumstance for which no precise rules can possibly be given."¹

This we confidently deny, and maintain that a precise rule can be given. The grand fallacy which pervades this facetious argument proceeds from the fact that rule 3, and even its proximate, rule 4, are grossly violated. The *instantiæ convenientes* and the *instantiæ absentiæ in proximo*, the media of comparison, do not even resemble each other in every respect with the exception of the presence, on the one hand, of three names and the presence of Jacobinism; and the absence, on the other hand, of three names and the absence of Jacobinism.

As correct arguments in compliance with rule 3, let us select the following:—

These two straight-lines do not enclose space; if they are made to enclose space they cease to be straight: therefore these two straight-lines cannot enclose space.

Animal life is sustained by organic substances; animal life, if deprived of these, becomes extinct: animal life therefore necessarily depends for existence upon organic substances.

In chemical notation—Cane or ordinary sugar, when crystallized, has the composition, $C_{12} H_{11} O_{11}$. Eliminate either of these, and sugar ceases to exist. Therefore sugar is necessarily composed of these elements.

¹ *Essay on Bacon.*

As a correct argument in compliance with rule 4, let us select the following :—

This wheat was supplied with a certain manure, and is luxuriant in growth. That wheat was not supplied with the manure, and is not luxuriant in growth. In conformity with rule 4, the two cases are precisely similar in every respect, with the exception of the presence and the absence respectively of the manure.

Then in conformity with rules 1 and 5, on the one hand, and rules 2 and 6 on the other, nothing can be the cause of the difference between the two patches of wheat ; unless it is the presence of the manure in the one case, and its absence in the other.

The only remaining step is to bring forward the universal proposition—Every change must have a cause, and deduce from this that the presence of the manure is a *sine qua non* of the superiority which the one patch of wheat has over the other.

But how do we arrive at the universal in question, namely, every change must have a cause ? When by the direct method, in compliance with rule 3, we infer that a certain antecedent is a cause of a certain consequent, we universalize from this, and come to the conclusion that every such antecedent is the cause of such consequent. Again, when we compare together all the arguments which establish these instances of special universal causation, we find that they all agree in a certain respect, and this agreement is expressed in the formula of cause and effect as given above. The universal following from this formula is the one in question, namely, Every change must have a cause.

The reasoning here used as an illustration of rule 4 corresponds to Mr. Mill's indirect Method of Difference. We have to pass through several steps before reaching the conclusion, and have also to call in the aid of deduction. In the direct method, that is, when we are able to conform to rule 3, we reach the conclusion at one step ; and were it not that we thus procure the universal proposition, Every change must have a cause, we should not be able to arrive at conclusive results by means of the indirect method.

Having during the course of this inquiry referred to the sequel for the explanation of two questions, it behoves us now to consider them. These are the absolute inconceivableness of the contradictory of a necessary truth or conjunction, and the infinity of space.

In relation to the first of these questions, that acute metaphysician, the late Professor Ferrier, has, in his *Institutes of Metaphysic*, the following proposition :—

“We can be ignorant only of what can possibly be known ; in other words, there can be an ignorance only of that of which there can be a knowledge.”^m

^m *Institutes. Theory of Ignorance, Proposition iii.*

In his explanation of this proposition, he remarks that

"Ignorance, properly so called, that is, the ignorance which is a defect, must not be confounded with a nescience of the opposites of the necessary truths of reason; in other words, with a nescience of that which it would contradict the nature of all intelligence to know. Such nescience is no defect or imperfection—it is, on the contrary, the very strength or perfection of reason; and therefore, such nescience is not regarded as ignorance When boys at school are taught Euclid, they learn that the enclosure of space by two straight lines is what cannot be known but they do not learn that they are equally incapable of being ignorant of such matters When we consider it well, we discover that the supposition that we can be ignorant of that which is absolutely and necessarily unknowable to all intelligence is as extreme a violation of the law of contradiction as it is possible to conceive. We perceive that a nescience of the contradictory is not ignorance, but the very essence of intelligence; and that there can be an ignorance only of that which can be known, or otherwise expressed, of that which is not contradictory."

We have here a striking example of the advantage of carrying the war into the enemy's country. In order to be well informed of the nature of knowledge and certainty, it is also necessary to be perfectly acquainted with the nature of nescience, ignorance, and doubt. When attention is drawn to the fact, it must be very evident that when a conjunction is demonstrated to be necessary, it is tantamount to proving the falsehood of its negation. For instance, if it is proved that a triangle is necessarily three-sided, this amounts to proving the falsehood of the negation of this statement, because the truth of a necessary conjunction, by the law, *lex exclusi medii*, involves the untruth of its contrary. If it is proved that a given conjunction is necessary, it is also proved by implication that its being other than necessary is inconceivable, or what cannot be known. But this unknowableness is not the consequence of ignorance, but of nescience, positive conviction the result of proof that a thing cannot be known. This, then, is the character of the absolutely inconceivable as opposed to the simply non-conceived, but nevertheless possibly conceivable. Colour, in its multitudinous varieties, is to the blind man the non-conceived or inconceivable to him, but not the necessarily and universally inconceivable, because he is fully convinced that men in general are intimately acquainted with the world of vision. In short, the necessarily inconceivable is that which is proved by the following inductive argument to be such:—this is inconceivable; eliminate from this its inconceivableness, and it ceases to exist; therefore this is necessarily inconceivable.

The next question which we have to examine is the infinity of space. This is inferred in the following manner:—By in-

ductive reasoning it is discovered that matter presupposes space, but that space does not presuppose matter. This relation between the two is obtained by ascertaining that there is a necessary conjunction between matter and space, but not, conversely, between space and matter. The necessary consequence of this relation between matter and space is, the former presupposes the latter. Matter, therefore, presupposes space.

Again, examine any portion of space, and you will find that there is nothing analogous to a limit or bound inherent to its nature. Indeed it is demonstrable by inductive reasoning that the negative attribute, illimitableness, is a necessary characteristic of any portion of space which one submits to examination.

Again, when any portion of matter is submitted to a like examination, it is found by inductive argument that it is necessarily bounded or figured; between matter and limitation, therefore, there is a necessary conjunction, and this relation is mutual, for no limit, bound, or figure—no matter; and no matter—no limit, bound, or figure.

Now it has been shewn that any given portion of space is without limit, in-finite. It has also been shewn that a limit is a necessary characteristic of matter, and that matter presupposes space; therefore a limit or bound must also do so. To attribute a limit to space, therefore, involves both a contradiction and a *petitio principii*, a contradiction because space is proved to be necessarily illimitable, a *petitio principii* because a limit presupposes matter, which presupposes space.

Finally, every necessary conjunction implies a universal one, therefore if any given portion of space is necessarily illimitable, we are constrained by the law of universalization to conclude that all space is infinite.

This truth, however, is reached inferentially and negatively. It has been indicated above that we can neither presentatively in perception, nor representatively in imagination, be cognizant of all space, of space as spreading out without bound from any point; for since we can only be either intuitively or pictorially conscious of a portion of space at one time, to be thus cognizant of all space would require infinite time. We cannot therefore have either presentative or representative knowledge of all space.

It is not, however, to be supposed that we are totally ignorant of that space which must ever be beyond our ken. The portions of extension of which we possess presentative knowledge, fully represent to us all other portions of the same; this is true also of the universal in number. The universal proposition being infinite in extension, it is impossible to have either presentative or representative knowledge of the whole of its contents. The

instances of necessary conjunction, however, from which we infer the universal and, indeed, every instance of such conjunction contained in the universal, and summoned out of it to receive representational embodiment in imagination, exactly typify every other instance lurking beyond our ken within its boundless reach.

Sir William Hamilton maintains that we can neither conceive space as infinite, nor yet as finite, and that, consequently, we are bound to think of its extension as indefinite. Now, in the first place, we *cannot* conceive space as finite, because, as has been shewn, any given portion of space is necessarily in-finite, consequently all space is infinite. In the second place, we *can* conceive space as infinite, that is, as has just been indicated, we are constrained to conceive any given portion of it as in-finite, and are forced to *infer* from this that all space is illimitable.

We again repeat, however, that there is a sense in which it is impossible to conceive the infinite. We are not able either presentatively in perception, or representatively in conception or in imagination, to know space in its illimitable totality, because this would demand never-ending time. We are forced, however, to conclude, which is reasoning as opposed to perceiving, conceiving, or imagining, that space is infinite. Although then we can neither perceive, conceive, nor imagine the infinite proper, we are, nevertheless, constrained to infer its existence.

V. As the majority of men have only two ideas of philosophy, and judge that a man must belong either to the school of Bacon, Locke, and Mill, or to that of Descartes, Kant, and Hamilton, we shall here endeavour to shew that the views adopted in this essay are not essentially those held by the *à priori* school, because they differ in some respects from those held by the opposite school. It has been objected to the views herein entertained, that the Canon of Induction could never lead to a single discovery, as it amounts to no more than this—whatever is, is; and that one would be guilty of some absurdity as soon as one attempted to demonstrate anything in accordance with it; which objection of course implies that it is not the Canon of Induction, for, undoubtedly, if it is, it can lead to no absurdity, but, on the contrary, keep one from falling into it. Moreover, no Canon of Induction can be expected to accomplish much in the way of making discoveries, for its sole office is to enable one to know when the conclusions derived from data procured by observation and experiment are properly or logically drawn. But the best reply to this criticism is to enter upon an examination of the Kantian doctrine, and to lay bare the character of the latter as tested by the Canon of Induction.

According to the Kantian system, all first principles which

are held to be necessary in the first degree, come under the head either of logical or mathematical necessity.

Logical necessity is said to follow from the laws of Identity, Contradiction, and Excluded Middle. The definition of a triangle, for example, is a necessary truth, because it comes both under the law of Identity, and the law of Contradiction. In other words, the definition of a triangle is an analytical proposition, and a necessary truth of the first degree, because the predicate does no more than unfold the contents of the subject-notion. That is, when the notion of a triangle is realized, one must with absolute certainty be aware that the proposition which explicates its contents is a necessary truth in accordance with the laws mentioned.

Let us then proceed to examine the pretensions set up in behalf of the laws of Identity and Contradiction. The former of these is expressed by the formula, *A is A*. This is held to be a necessary and universal proposition. But such propositions, we have endeavoured to shew, are never original in their character, never presentatively obtained. If therefore the proposition—*Every A is A*, must be a conclusion from prior knowledge, it becomes desirable that this should be shewn to be the case. This proposition then is derived, in accordance with the Canon of Induction, from the following premisses:—*This A is A*, and without being *A* cannot be *A*; therefore this *A* is necessarily *A*: therefore every *A* is *A*. The apparent silliness of this reasoning will disappear, if we bear in mind that it is by Perception we know both that *A is A*, and that, without being *A*, it cannot be *A*, and that it is by reasoning we then conclude that *A* is necessarily *A*. Perception cannot cognize necessary conjunction; this can only be inferred from a positive and a negative premiss as given above.

The law of Identity being, as a necessary and universal truth, infinite in extension, cannot by a finite mind be intuitively apprehended, and must therefore be inferred from a necessary truth or conjunction, which conjunction can be proved only by inductive reasoning.

In further demonstration of the law that no universal truths are self-evident or original, we must shew that reasoning, when isolated from other mental operations which are not essential to it, is in the whole of Comprehension, or the Category of Difference. Like Perception, Reason, the inferring operation, has no power of generalization, of cognizing resemblances, of combining individual inferences into a class, and of expressing them in a single proposition. To do this is the function of Conception (*conception*), which performs the same uniting policy for Reason that Perception. All reasoning therefore, considered in a

state of isolation from mental operations which are possibly separable from it, reasoning apart from Conception, must have singular premisses, and a singular conclusion. This is why the Canon of Induction is stated in the singular form. It is not indeed safe, when seeking to discover necessary conjunctions among facts, to search among those of the same class for one positive and one negative premiss only, but we should take note of all that present themselves; for the wider our observation, or the more repeated our experimentation, the more certain shall we be that our premisses are not incorrect. That however which is a prudent course to pursue in the investigation of facts, in order to insure freedom from mistake, is not absolutely essential to the perfection of the inductive process. All that is indispensable in order to infer necessary conjunction and universal conjunction therefrom, is an individual instance of that relation among facts which is expressed by the Canon. What do we gather from this? That the *dictum de omni et nullo* is not the foundation of all argument; that the laws of Identity and Contradiction, inasmuch as they are declared to be necessary and universal, are not the root of first principles even of the analytical order; that since ratiocination is a descent from generals to particulars, ratiocination is not the first and sole step in reasoning; that since the syllogism is said to be the expression of deductive reasoning, and also of inductive reasoning as understood by some, the syllogism is not the expression of the primary operation of Reason, which precedes Deduction, and is not expressed syllogistically. And what, on the other hand, becomes of Induction, if that be an inference from particulars to particulars, or even from one particular to another? At the root of all reasoning, we have nothing but isolated singulars standing, like so many piers of a bridge, aloof from each other, waiting for the superstructure that is to unite them; singulars which warrant no inference whatever from this instance to that. All reasoning from one particular, or set of particulars, to another presupposes Conception, which conceives the second as precisely similar to the first, but can only do this in so far as it has a warrant for doing so, which warrant can be nothing less than a universal proposition drawn from necessary conjunction as proved by inductive argument. In the absence of this universal, the inference can only be probable.

The law of Identity, and the same is true of the law of Contradiction and the law of Excluded Middle, seems clearly therefore to be derived from the particular. The first law is a universal statement that a thing is what it is, gathered by inductive reasoning both from the observation that any given thing is what it is, and that it is not what it is not. The second is a

universal statement resulting in the same manner both from the observation that any given thing is not what it is not, but is what it is. The two principles are derived from the same premisses, and are equipollent, the law of equipollency considered as a necessary and universal truth being similarly derived. It amounts to the same thing therefore to declare that every A is A, as to declare that whatsoever is not A is not A, or nothing can be A and not A.

The laws which have now been investigated are said to be the criterion of formal or logical necessity only. The Kantians also bring under the head of truths necessary in the first degree, the synthetical judgments of mathematics. These are said to be in necessary matter, whereas logical necessity has to do only with form. The latter is binding only on thinking, the former upon the object of thought. In an analytical judgment the predicate is said simply to unfold the contents of the subject, and does not therefore, in the least, extend our knowledge. On the other hand, in a synthetical judgment, the predicate is said to assert of the subject something not already contained in it. All analytical judgments are necessary, but all synthetical judgments are not, only those which are *à priori*, or in necessary matter. Necessary conjunction in these two cases therefore does not follow from the same cause. We have seen what the former results from; we have next to investigate the claims advanced in behalf of the latter.

The necessity of synthetical judgment *à priori* is said to arise from the fact that the matter as well as the form is supplied from within. Space, for instance, is assumed to be one of the intuitions of the mind, the form of sensible cognition; and is therefore, we opine, reckoned to be so perfectly familiar to one that all predications concerning it are known as necessary and universal. But allowing, for the sake of argument, that space were subjective, that fact alone is not sufficient to account for the origin of necessary conjunctions in geometry, any more than the same is sufficient to account for the necessity of conjunctions in analytical judgments. Let us select for discussion, from among instances given of the latter, the proposition—All islands are surrounded by water. Now regarding this as a formal or analytical judgment exclusively, we even then cannot know it to be a necessary and universal conjunction without the aid of inductive reasoning. We find that every time we examine the notion—*island*, it contains the attributes—*land surrounded by water*. But although we may do this a million times, we shall not be warranted to draw the above conclusion from it. Before we can do this in a perfectly logical manner, we must also ascer-

tain that without containing the attributes—*land surrounded by water*, the notion—*island*, does not exist, and then from these two premisses conclude that—all islands are surrounded by water. Now, if even an analytical judgment cannot vindicate its necessity without thus coming under the Canon of Induction, it is very unlikely that a synthetical judgment *à priori* can do this. Two straight lines cannot enclose space. What if the matter of this proposition be entirely subjective; even in that case, all we can know by simple observation is, that as far as we have made the attempt, in thought, to follow two straight lines to infinity, they have never shewn the least tendency to enclose space. But surely we cannot from such an *inductio per enumerationem simplicem* educe the proposition in question. Nay, we must also observe that when, in thought, we make two straight lines enclose space, they cease to be straight lines, and then from the comparison of these two courses of observation infer—this commonly in the instance before us being done implicitly, or without our being reflectively conscious of the process—that two straight lines cannot enclose space. We cannot therefore receive as true what Professor Mansel remarks on this point, namely, that “The possibility of forming synthetical judgments *à priori* in geometry admits of only one adequate explanation, namely, that the presentative intuitions, as well as the representative notion, is derived from within and not from without; in other words, that both the matter and form of the judgment are determined subjectively.”* We are fully convinced that the Kantian stronghold, the subjectivity of necessary truth, must submit to come under the dominion of the Canon of Induction, and for this reason, namely, the Canon embraces the whole realm of necessary conjunction, whether within the mind or without. It is precisely by the same reasoning we prove that water is necessarily composed of oxygen and hydrogen, as that we prove that two straight lines cannot make a figure, or that a circle must have a centre.

We may here mention incidentally that if space is infinite, as we have endeavoured to demonstrate above, and if the human mind is not, the hypothesis that space is subjective involves the contradiction that the finite contains the infinite. If space can be proved to be infinite, it is manifest that we must exist in space, not space in us; and this is the common conviction of mankind. But to resume the subject.

“Why,” asks Professor Mansel, “can I give, in imagination, to a quadruped body what experience assures me is possessed by bipeds only? And why can I not, in like manner, invest straight lines with an attribute

* *Prolegomena Logica.* Second Edition, p. 106.

which experience has uniformly presented in curves? Can it be said that the ideas in the latter case are contradictory, and that their union is therefore forbidden by the laws of formal thinking? By no means. *Straight* and *curved*, viewed merely as objects of sense, are opposed only as *black* and *white*, or as *biped* and *quadruped*; they cannot, that is, be thought as existing at the same time in the same subject."^o

Just so, and it rather surprises us how Professor Mansel can fail to see that this is the reason why we cannot conceive two straight lines as enclosing space. The subject in this instance, be it known, is not line, but straight-line. Now, to suppose two straight-lines as enclosing space is to suppose that they become bent-lines while they continue straight-lines, and if this is not contradiction, nothing is such; and if this is not opposed to the laws of formal thinking, what can be opposed to them? The reason therefore why we cannot invest straight lines with an attribute which experience has uniformly presented in curves is, that by so investing them we should be attempting the impossible, namely, conceiving lines as being, at the same time, both straight and curved. But why can we give, in imagination, to a quadruped body what experience assures us is possessed by bipeds only? Because we can do so without being involved in contradiction. Such an anomaly as a centaur does not, at once, strike us as contradictory, because it is quite possible, so far as mere outline goes, to picture such a monster. The enlightened physiologist, however, has no hesitation in pronouncing the living existence of a centaur to be quite incompatible with established laws of animal vitality.

Professor Ferrier, who seems to us to have gained a keener insight into the nature of necessary truth than any other philosopher with whom we are acquainted, gives the following as the canon of all philosophy:—"Affirm nothing except what is enforced by reason as a necessary truth—that is, as a truth, the supposed reversal of which would involve a contradiction; and deny nothing unless its affirmation involves a contradiction, that is, contradicts some truth or law of reason."^p Had Ferrier accounted for the origin of necessary and universal truth by deriving it inductively from the particular, we could add nothing to his views on this subject. He holds that there is but one kind of necessary truth, namely, that the supposed reversal of which involves contradiction. Professor Mansel however gives, in all, three classes of necessary judgments, which reminds us that reasoning was once divided into several kinds, according to the

^o *Prolegomena Logica*. Second Edition, p. 109.

^p *Institutes of Metaphysics*. Introduction, § 34.

matter on which it was exercised. Professor Mansel's classification of necessary judgments is as follows :—

"1. Judgments necessary in the first degree, or logical and mathematical necessity. These are dependent on the laws of our mental operations, and their contradictions are neither conceivable nor supposable.

"2. Judgments necessary in the second degree, or psychological necessity. These are dependent on the restrictions of our mental constitution; and their contradictories are supposable, but not conceivable. To this class belong the principles of causality and of substance.

"3. Judgments necessary in the third degree, or physical necessity. These are dependent on the laws of the material world, and their contradictories are both supposable and conceivable, but never actually true."¹

Professor Mansel will recognize as his own the following words, in the truth of which we cordially acquiesce :—"Whatever we are compelled to regard as necessary, must be so in consequence of laws, not of the object, but of the subject." Now judgments which are necessary in the first degree have already been discussed at some length, and it is to *formal* judgments of this class that we think, with Ferrier, the expression necessary truth or conjunction should be limited, not so however as to exclude mathematical, psychological, and physical necessity, but to embrace them under the head of *logical* necessity. Let us then, in the next place, proceed to examine the judgments said to be necessary in the second degree.

We cannot see that any conjunction among facts can be held to be necessary, unless, by a law of thought, we are compelled to conclude that such is the case. Between us and all being, stands knowing; and if therefore, either in mind or in nature, there exists, among facts, such a thing as necessary connection, it is impossible for us to be perfectly assured of this, unless by a fatal operation of our intelligence, we are left no other alternative. This, then, in the last resort, being the only kind of necessary conjunction which exists as *ad nos*, it comes to be seen that we have no ground for maintaining that there is a second and a third degree of necessity. A conjunction is either necessary or not necessary, namely, contingent; and the only really necessary conjunction is that, the reversal of which is neither conceivable nor supposable, because in contradiction with the results of inductive reasoning. When the contradictory of a judgment can be supposed but cannot be conceived, the ability to suppose so much indicates that a barrier of contradiction does

¹ *Prolegomena Logica*. Second Edition, p. 176.

not check one's progress in this direction; and the inability to conceive the same is that arising simply from want of material wherewith to frame a notion, there being no presentation of it, in any sense to the mind. Such inability is pure ignorance, and surely ignorance cannot guarantee the necessity of any conjunction, but leaves it an open question. It is owing to this ignorance indeed that the contradictory is supposable, for were the ignorance converted into nescience, could we demonstrate the falsehood of the contradictory by demonstrating the truth of that which it contradicted, neither could the contradictory be supposed.

Again, as to judgments said to be necessary in the third degree, the same objection obtains. To speak, for instance, of the laws of the planetary motions as absolutely binding upon the moving bodies themselves independently of the existence of astronomical science, amounts to this—either we only suppose this state of things as subsisting among the planetary bodies, or if these bodies are really subject to laws of planetary motions, they can only be indubitably known to us to be thus obedient to them, in so far as we are under the necessity of inferring such laws. The only necessary conjunction, therefore, obtaining among the phenomena of the physical world, of which we can feel certain, is that which in accordance with the Canon of Induction we conclude and must conclude to be in existence.

The Kantians hold that analytical judgments are merely formal, that their necessity does not extend to the matter of thought. But when it is proved by inductive argument that all islands are surrounded by water, what shadow of a justification is there for limiting the truth of this proposition to the mere form, or the notion—*island*? Every one sees that the object named island is surrounded by water, and that if it were not, it would not be the object named island; and that therefore, in order to be what it is, it must be surrounded by water: wherefore, all islands are surrounded by water. In like manner, wherein does the analysis of the chemist differ from this, who finds, for instance, that marble is composed of lime and fixed air? The physical conjunctions here instanced are, as regards the laws of necessity and universality, exactly in the same category as a mere formal conjunction for which superior exactness is erroneously challenged. It is a great mistake therefore to make such a wide distinction between them.

Another feature in which our divergence from the Kantian doctrine comes into prominence is the following:—Sir W. Hamilton contends that the only logical induction is that which infers the whole from the enumerated units which compose it, and that it is expressed by the syllogism. For example:—

X Y Z are some B ;
 X Y Z are all A : therefore
 All A is some B.

Reasoning from particulars to generals, he pronounces to be extra-logical, which must mean incomplete or invalid reasoning. Now our aim in this essay has been to shew that such reasoning, when explicitly developed, is strictly valid or logically conclusive. So strong indeed is the presumption in favour of the competency of the Baconian or material induction for logical conclusiveness, that to regard it as extra-logical, and that not from our yet imperfect knowledge of its laws, but from viewing them on *a priori* grounds, as inherently extra-logical, indicated no small amount of blind devotion to a pet theory on the part of the objector, and cannot fail to be regarded with disfavour by the scientific world.

VI. As examples of the application of the views herein propounded, and with the intent, at the same time, of suggesting comparison between them and those entertained on the same subject by Baron Liebig, we select, from an article* lately written by him, two instances of chemical investigation.

The first we describe in our own words. When Daguerre had placed, in an old cupboard, a number of plates on which he had experimented in the *camera obscura* without success, and found to his great astonishment, some weeks afterwards, on removing one of the plates, that there was a most distinct impression upon it, he necessarily concluded that there must be something in the cupboard to account for the formation of the picture. This was a deduction from the universal principle that—Every change must have a cause. He had now to ascertain, by observation and inductive reasoning, what there was in the cupboard to produce this striking effect. The cupboard was a receptacle for all sorts of things,—tools, apparatuses, chemical reagents, and among them a basin containing metallic mercury. Now, there are only two formulas of induction, according to which his search for the cause could be regulated in this instance, namely, the one by which he proved that certain things were not necessary to the production of the picture, and the one by which he proved that a certain substance was necessary. Thus, in the first place, tools, apparatuses, and other things were present when the picture was produced; but when these were removed, the picture was still produced: these, therefore were not necessary to its production. But, in the second place, metallic mercury was present when the picture was produced;

* Cornhill Magazine, September.

when, however, the mercury was not present, the picture was not formed: therefore metallic mercury was necessary to the formation of the picture. There was, however, another difficulty to explain, namely, How could metallic mercury act upon a plate which had no contact with it? This difficulty would be suggested by the universal principle that, whenever one thing acts upon another, there must be contact between them; that therefore there must be contact between the mercury and the plate. This again is deduction. The explanation required is this:—mercury is a volatile substance; the cupboard would therefore be filled with mercurial vapour, which would come into contact with the plate. Here, again, we have deductive reasoning. Wherever, indeed, induction has previously established a necessary conjunction between two objects, there is afterwards full scope for deductive inference therefrom. But where deduction cannot start from indubitable principles, but proceeds from data which are more or less open to question, or are perhaps only shrewd hypotheses, the inquirer can only get at demonstration by means of inductive argument.

Baron Liebig points out the distinction between stumbling by mere chance upon a discovery, as in Daguerre's case, and the intelligent discovery of a fact by the aid of anticipation, as in Talbot's case. This anticipation is effective exactly in proportion as our deductive reasoning can be rendered conclusive; and ineffective exactly in proportion as deductive reasoning, owing to our defective knowledge, cannot yet be made conclusive. Inductive reasoning must predominate in the earlier stages of an experimental science, and there must in these stages be much guess-work, and much trusting to chance. But when a science has been brought to a state of considerable advancement, deduction becomes more and more available for making further discoveries in it, by suggesting the line of investigation which has to be taken.

We shall now examine the more recondite example which Baron Liebig gives, and quote his own words:—

"Suppose it were the rusting of iron in the air which had to be explained. Preliminary inquiries into the composition of rust have determined that it contains iron, oxygen, and water; and besides that, the composition of air is thoroughly known. So the elements for the explanation of the rusting of iron appear to be completely at hand; the experiment, however, shews that in an atmosphere of oxygen, and in the presence of watery vapour, iron does not rust. It is therefore evident, that besides oxygen and vapour, another component part of air must be present for the conversion of iron into rust."

We shall proceed to state, in accordance with the formulas

of induction, what has here been advanced ; but before this is done, it is perhaps desirable to notice that Liebig mentions "a particular case in which iron, in a damp atmosphere, may get rusty even in the absence of carbonic acid ; that is, when the air contains ammonia, but then the rusting ceases as soon as all the ammonia has been absorbed."

First, then, as to the composition of common rust, the chemist discovers that it contains iron, oxygen, and water, that without these it does not exist, and that therefore it is necessarily composed of these. Secondly, as to the causes of rust, it is found that atmospheric air and watery vapour in contact with iron are followed by rust, that without these in contact with iron no rust follows, and that therefore these in contact with iron must be necessary to the formation of rust.

In these two instances the reasoning is inductive. From particular premisses, necessary conjunction is inferred, which amounts to the same thing as universal conjunction.

The substances concerned in the production of rust are, however, compound ones. For instance, atmospheric air contains nitrogen, oxygen, and a small quantity of carbonic acid ; yet rust has no nitrogen and carbonic acid in its composition ; it is therefore inferred that very probably they are not essential to its production.

Here the reasoning is deductive, but from a hypothetical datum, namely, that what is not discovered in the composition of a body is not demanded to generate the same ; that therefore nitrogen and carbonic acid are not necessary to the formation of rust. This datum being, however, hypothetical merely, the conclusion which is drawn has to be verified by induction. Here take note, that deductive reasoning is conclusive only when the data which it employs have been vigorously established by inductive argument. But now for the next step.

It has been demonstrated that air and watery vapour in contact with iron are necessarily followed by rust. But it is presumed that two of the component parts of air, namely, nitrogen and carbonic acid, are unessential concomitants. An experiment is therefore tried which involves the elimination of these, namely, oxygen alone with watery vapour are brought into connection with iron, but the result is that no rust is formed.

Here the hypothesis—that of the elements composing air, oxygen alone was necessary to create rust, has been falsified by induction ; and the conclusion is, that either nitrogen, or carbonic acid, or both, are a *sine qua non* in its production. The next step is to discover, by having recourse once more to induction, which of these three alternatives is true.

It can be proved inductively that nitrogen is an unessential concomitant, and therefore that carbonic acid is a *sine qua non*. For when it is known that oxygen is indispensable, but is not sufficient alone to produce the effect, and also that nitrogen is not essential, then we are bound to conclude that carbonic acid is essential. This is induction according to the Method of Residues. But we may also ascertain by direct inductive reasoning that carbonic acid is necessary, and then, by the same means, that nitrogen is not.

"But," continues Liebig, "rust does not contain any carbonic acid; and so the question arises, What share the acid has in that process? Another known fact is now sufficient to complete the explanation; viz., the properties of the carbonate of protoxide of iron. In a damp atmosphere this carbonate absorbs oxygen, and the protoxide is converted into the higher oxide, which does not combine with carbonic acid. During the conversion of the metal into rust at first, the lower oxide is generated, binding carbonic acid; but the latter is freed again when the protoxide becomes sesquioxide, and so the carbonic acid can resume its original action on the remaining metal for the second and hundredth time, until gradually the whole piece is thoroughly converted into rust."

Here the reasoning is deductive. The chemist is able to explain the absence of carbonic acid from rust, by knowing that this acid is concerned in generating carbonate of protoxide of iron, which in a damp atmosphere absorbs oxygen, and liberates the carbonic acid, thus forming rust.

A fitting conclusion to this inquiry will be, to make a few observations on the position which Mr. Mill holds in relation to the philosopher whose tenets he has the credit—with men of his own school—of having so cleverly and effectually demolished in his late work. There can be little room for doubt that Sir William Hamilton laid himself open to refutation in more instances than one. His Law of the Conditioned, based upon the Antinomies of Kant, admitted of being overthrown with no very tremendous effort by a thinker of Mr. Mill's calibre; and his theory of reasoning failed to converge to a focus all the light which was already gained on the subject; it was behind, rather than in advance, of what was already discovered in this field of thought. Hamilton lived more in the world of books than in that of living men. Great in learning, he was not equally great as a thinker, and an analyst of the mental world. But he had, nevertheless, what we hold to be, strong points. He had undoubting faith in the spontaneous and universal convictions of the human race; and his merit as a philosopher mainly consists in the strong, able, and lucid manner in which he vindicated, both as a scholar and as a thinker, the trustworthiness of these

convictions. We do not maintain that Common Sense (*voûs*),—that is, Reason operating we know not how, the completed result only being revealed to us; this being held by many to be primary, and therefore inexplicable, and self-evident—we do not maintain that Common Sense, thus understood, is the final appeal in philosophy; but we fully believe that it ought to be the point from which we start. Till a better is discovered, no more philosophic course can be followed than to begin with the speculative presumption that our spontaneous and universal convictions are to be trusted. We make use advisedly of the words, speculative presumption. Practical convictions we shall have whether, speculatively, we place confidence in them or not. Let what may then, in the second place, be thought of these convictions, that is, after a reflective examination of them, they must, in the first place, and always practically,—by sensationalist, idealist, transcendalist, and realist alike, be attended with implicit reliance in their truthfulness. Now the obvious impression derivable from this fact is, that these deliverances of consciousness cannot be mendacious. Is it indeed credible that the God of Truth, unless the humiliating fact were proved, would keep us all our days in bondage to a lie?

To renounce Common Sense entirely as a guide is quite as unphilosophic a procedure as the opposite course, namely, making it the court of final appeal in philosophy. Reid, and perhaps Hamilton, estimated its claims at too high a value; but if they did this, it was by that law of mind which causes a recoil from the extravagancies of sensationists, idealists, and sceptics. Now, if we take a judicial view of the question in dispute, we must bear in mind that before knowledge of any subject can reach a demonstrative, scientific, or final stage, it must previously pass through at least two stages,—a spontaneous or birth stage, and a transitional or growth stage; and that many truths of a simple character, such as the axioms and definitions of geometry, and of a fundamental and obtrusive character, such as the independent existence of the external world, come full grown to man in their spontaneous stage; full grown, we mean, as practical convictions. To the reflective inquirer, they may or may not, according to one's peculiar turn of mind, appear to be exactly such as Common Sense declares them to be. This variety of opinion exists, because the evidence demanded by reason in its reflective or philosophic research is not complete. When this evidence becomes conclusive, the mental peculiarities of philosophers will be controlled, and unanimity will prevail. Now to notice some of these peculiarities, the demonstrative inquirer, whether the philosopher with *à posteriori* bias, like Mr. Mill;

or with *à priori* bias, like Ferrier, too frequently seeks to limit knowledge to what is within his own clear but yet unextensive view. Thousand to one, says Lessing, the goal of your philosophy will be the spot where you become weary of thinking any further. He who insists too much for proof in all things seems to overlook the fact, that before knowledge can come to him in an acceptable shape, it must pass through certain preliminary processes. He is the finisher of other men's work, yet he would have the iron ready to work into rails, or into Armstrong guns, before he admits its existence, and is loth to acknowledge the necessity of those preparatory processes by which it is divided from the ore. Although we must, whenever it is practicable, have recourse to this stringent method, yet it is possible, by too bigoted an adherence to it, to have our mental horizon sadly circumscribed,—to have a cold shade of negation chilling spontaneous thought, and frowning down the uprising of a wise and pleasant faith. The part of true wisdom is to accept, not merely what is demonstrated, but to open wide the portals of the mind to those spontaneous and transitional thoughts and theories which invariably precede a final or scientific stage of knowledge. A grand and powerful inducement for cultivating this temper of mind is, that the superior truths are those which enter last upon their final growth, and are consequently, at this present moment, demanding from us the exercise of a large-hearted faith.

Now we humbly opine that every one who addresses himself to the lofty task of discovering philosophic truth, ought to start with a reverent trust that the faculties which God has given him are not leading him astray, even in their spontaneous deliverances, and more especially if these are the universal assurances of mankind; and that it is certainly more in accordance with the spirit of true philosophy, to seek to establish these deliverances than to overthrow them. In the inquiry which we have made into the nature of necessary conjunction in this essay, we started with the complete adoption of this principle, and we trust that the result is not of such a nature as to lead any candid and unprejudiced judge to remark, that we started with a wrong method, and that "philosophy," to quote the words of Ferrier, "exists only to correct the inadvertencies of man's ordinary thinking;" that "philosophy assumes, and must assume, that man does not naturally think aright, but must be taught to do so; that truth does not come to him spontaneously, but must be brought to him by his own exertions." We may here mention, by the way, that hard as Ferrier hits at Common Sense,

* *Institutes*. Introduction.

his view of necessary truth exactly ratifies the declaration of our spontaneous intelligence as to the existence of such truth. But because Common Sense, forsooth, declares the independent existence of the external world, and according to his merciless logic there is no such contradiction, O then! Common Sense is not to be trusted! It is quite true that the world, as known, cannot exist out of synthesis with the knower. The known world is (subject *plus* object). Now this synthesis cannot be what it is, and at the same time be less than what it is. You cannot, at one and the same time, predicate contradictory attributes of one and the same subject. This is Ferrier's position; and, so far as it extends, it is unassailable. But there seems to be a sphere which does not come within its extension, namely, the external world *before* it becomes known.

Reason infers, and cannot avoid doing so, that in the *order of nature*, the cognition of an external object presupposes the *prior* existence of that object, that is, cannot avoid concluding that the object must have existed before it could possibly become known. A man looks at St. Paul's Cathedral. Did it exist before he looked at it, and does it exist after he has ceased to do so? Yes, from his perception of it, he is forced to conclude that it must have existed before he cast his eyes upon it, and consequently that it must exist when he has taken his eyes from it. This, we believe, is the root of the assurance, that the external world exists independently of the knower; and if this be correct, Common Sense is veracious again.

Mr. Mill's position as a philosopher seems to us to be something like the following:—He is more lucid and less assailable than Hamilton, because he is, when tried by Common Sense, of a sceptical turn of mind, and does not feel disposed to admit the veracity of our primary convictions, unless he has presented to him by others the most conclusive proof of it. He performs a negative function rather than a positive one. He seems, for example, to be an idealist, not from the force of his argumentation, like Ferrier, but because he does not deem the evidence which is cited in support of the realistic doctrine to be satisfactory. Similarly, it is for lack of evidence that he appears to deny the existence of necessary truth. The function which he performs as a psychologist may be compared perhaps to that which the *pylorus* fulfils in the digestive economy; and Common Sense counts with him, as with Ferrier, for nothing. Mr. Mill, in short, is great at constructing a system; he tests much and well, but he originates little.

W. G. D.

THE SITE OF SODOM AND GOMORRAH.

FREQUENT as is the mention of these doomed cities in Scripture, and notorious as must have been, one would have thought, their geographical position, it might seem almost incredible that their site should be in any way open to dispute at the present time. Yet so it is; and that not merely to the extent of a mile or two, this way or that (which, considering that there are no visible traces of them left, would not be very wonderful), but to the extent of full fifty miles;—some following the traditional, and we may say, until lately, the universal view, placing the cities at the *south* end of the Dead Sea;—some, and especially Mr. Grove and Mr. Tristram, two of the best living authorities on Biblical geography, placing them at the *north* end of the Dead Sea. To investigate in detail the evidence on which these two views rest is the object of the present paper. This evidence may be conveniently divided into three general groups, 1st. The Biblical statements concerning the site of the five cities before their destruction, as also concerning their sole survivor in later times—Zoar; 2nd. The statements of ancient writers and travellers as to the site of Zoar; 3rd. The names at present given to the localities in question by the Arabs, with any purely local indications that may exist on the spot.

I. *The Biblical Statements.* These are of course by far the most important, and must be held, if perfectly clear and unmistakable in their testimony, to be conclusive of the whole matter. The passages which we shall have to consider are the following:—as referring more or less distinctly to the site of the five cities before their destruction, Gen. x. 19; xiii. 10—12; xiv. 2, 3, 7, 8, 10; xviii. 16, 22, 33; xix. 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30;—as referring to the site of the later Zoar, Deut. xxxiv. 3; Isaiah xv. 5, 6; Jer. xlviii. 34.

(a). Gen. x. 19. "And the border of the Canaanites was from Zidon,—on the way to Gerar, as far as Gaza;—on the way to Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Zeboim, as far as Lasha."*

Two limits are here given for the possessions of the Canaanites, one on the south-west, Gaza, and one on the south-east, Lasha; but inasmuch as neither of these places would seem to have been in the writer's days well known, he has added besides

* The Authorized Version renders "as thou comest to Gerar," "as thou goest unto Sodom;" the expression in the original is, however, the same in each case *regā*, literally "thy going to," here used, of course, simply as a preposition (comp. Kalisch *in loc.*). The Authorized Version also inserts "even" before "unto Lasha," for which there is no warrant in the original, and which mars the exact parallelism between the two clauses.

in each case a line of general direction, somewhere along which they were to be found; placing Gaza on the way to Gerar, and Lasha on the way to Sodom and its neighbour cities. Both these lines of direction he plainly intends to be taken from Zidon as the common starting point; it being formally prefixed to the first, no other being named for the second, while the two clauses are precisely parallel to each other in construction, word for word. The idea generally entertained, that the second line is to be taken from Gaza eastwards, is hence quite out of the question, requiring as it would the insertion of the word "thence,"—"thence on the way to Sodom," etc.,—of which there is no trace. It may be noted also, that when this method of describing the boundaries of any territory, by drawing a line through various places along its borders, is adopted, entirely different forms of expression are used (see Numb. xxxiv. 3—12; Joshua xv. 1—12; xvi. 1—8; xvii. 7—9; xviii. 12—20; xix. 10—14, etc.). To define the borders of the Canaanites in this sense does not seem, moreover, to have been the object of the writer, but merely to give a general idea of the extent to which they had spread southwards from their first settlement—Zidon. Zidon, he says, was the "first-born" of Canaan (verse 15), *i. e.*, probably, the first and chief possession of the Canaanites in Syria, to which the younger tribes looked up as to their senior and superior. There were also, he tells us, many other tribes descended from the same source, who "afterward (*i. e.*, we must suppose, *after* this first settlement at Zidon) were spread abroad" (verse 18) over the land at large. Their general course was southwards; to shew the extent of their dispersion he naturally, therefore, selects the two southernmost of their settlements,—one on the west and one on the east, and defines the position of these by two general lines of direction drawn from the common fountain-head, Zidon, whence the dispersion spoken of had in fact taken place.

This being the natural and proper meaning of the passage, we proceed to inquire what relation, geographically, must have, as a consequence, subsisted between Lasha, the south-eastern boundary named, and Sodom, the well-known spot south of Zidon, on the way to which Lasha was to be found? The answer is self-evident; Sodom must clearly have been in the same eastward direction as Lasha, but a little *further south*, since in no other case could it be said that "on the way to Sodom," or, as it is literally, "in thy coming to Sodom," from Zidon, Lasha was to be found. Had Sodom been further north than Lasha, it must have stood "*beyond* Sodom, as far as Lasha" instead of "on the way to." To shew, however, that this is no assumption made merely to suit a particular view of the position

of Sodom, let us turn to the parallel clause concerning the south-western boundary: "on the way to Gerar, as far as Gaza." Here, if our argument be correct, Gerar should be in the west of Palestine, a little to the south of Gaza. And precisely so we find it; Gerar is some ten miles further off from Zidon than Gaza, and in the same westerly direction. So, again, we may refer to Gen. xxv. 18, where we read of "Shur, which is to the east of Egypt on the way to Assyria;" where plainly Assyria is further east than Shur. We conclude, therefore, that the writer of Gen. x. 19 without doubt intended to imply that Sodom and its neighbours were farther south than Lasha. Where then, we now ask, was Lasha? Unfortunately, it is nowhere again mentioned in the Bible, nor has any vestige of the name been found by modern travellers. Our only authorities on the point are Jerome and some other ancient writers, who say that Lasha was the same with Callirrhoë, the modern Zurka Main, a hot-sulphur spring which falls into the Dead Sea about ten miles from its northern end; with which identification the meaning of the word "fissure, or cleft," well agrees (see Smith's *Dict.*, art. *Lasha*). Plainly, then, Sodom and Gomorrah, which were still further south, cannot have been at the north end of the Sea, or the expressions used concerning their relation to Lasha would have been totally inappropriate, as well as opposed to Scripture parallels.

To estimate the full force of this testimony, however, it is necessary to glance for a moment at the signs of antiquity which this passage presents: 1st. We notice that Gaza is spoken of as a place little known, and requiring a special note of direction to fix its whereabouts; Gerar, on the contrary, is regarded as well known to all, and so employed to define the position of Gaza. Now in the days of Joshua Gaza was certainly sufficiently notorious; it was an independent state, with "towns and villages," as such assigned to Judah (Joshua xv. 47), though like the other Philistine cities, too powerful to be dispossessed at once (Joshua xiii. 3; comp. Judges i. 18; iii. 3); how prominent a part it played further on in the history of the Judges it is unnecessary to insist upon; it is more to our purpose to notice how twice—once in Joshua (x. 41), and once in the editorial notes to Deuteronomy (ii. 23; Authorized Version "Azzah"),—it is employed *alone* in the defining of certain limits. On the other hand, Gerar, though common in Genesis (xx. 1, 2; xxvi. 1, 6, 17, 20, 26), falls out of sight altogether in the later books, being never once named in the lists of places in Joshua, and in fact being only mentioned once again in the Bible (2 Chron. xiv. 13, 14), where the flight of the Ethiopians before Asa is described; it would seem then to have been part of the territory of Egypt. Clearly, then, had

Gen. x. 19 been written after or at the time of the conquest of Canaan, neither would Gaza have needed any further note of direction to determine its situation; nor would Gerar, now fallen into obscurity, have been the fitting place to mention to define it, if it had. The date of Genesis x. 19 must plainly have been very much earlier,—most probably before the incursion of the Caphtorim mentioned in Deut. ii. 23 (comp. Gen. x. 14). But then, 2nd., we notice that Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim are named as marking the line of direction to the south-east. Now in Gen. xiii. 10; Deut. xxxiv. 3, where the same locality is required to be designated, we find Zoar alone mentioned, no doubt from its being the only city left there when those passages were written; which however here, in Gen. x. 19, is altogether passed by. Surely the natural conclusion to be drawn is, that Gen. x. 19 was written *before* Sodom and Gomorrah were overthrown, or at all events while their situation was still notorious, and before Zoar rose into eminence. Their selection as the guides for the finding of Lasha is then reasonable enough, which otherwise must seem strange; and at the same time an explanation is given for the omission of Bela or Zoar, which we know was of inferior note to the other four (Gen. xix. 20, and comp. xiv. 2), though afterwards of course the guide to their original locality.^b

But if Gen. x. 19 be thus so extremely ancient—contemporaneous indeed with Abraham, the worth of its testimony to the site of Sodom is plainly immense; in fact, if we had but fuller proof of the identity of Lasha with Callirrhoë, it might be well regarded as conclusive to the whole controversy.

(b). Gen. xiii. 10—12, "And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the hollow of the Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere (before Jehovah destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah), like the garden of Jehovah, like the land of Egypt,—on the way to Zoar. Then Lot chose all the hollow of the Jordan. And Lot journeyed in the east, . . . and Lot dwelled in (or "among") the cities of the hollow, and pitched his tent as far as Sodom."^c

^b To this it may be objected, that if Sodom and the other cities were in existence when this passage was written, they surely should have been named as the southernmost of the Canaanitish settlements. But then what Scriptural evidence have we that they were peopled by Canaanites at all? They are plainly excluded from the list of Canaanitish tribes given just before, while in Gen. xiv. 4—8 they are coupled together very remarkably with the Rephaim, Zuzim, Emim, and Horites, the pre-Canaanitish inhabitants of the land, as joint sufferers from the attack of Chedorlaomer; may not their affinities then rather have lain in that direction?

^c The Authorized Version renders "east" instead of "in the east;" but the word here is not *מזרח*, but *מקום*, which in other places plainly has this latter

Four points have here to be noted :—(i.) The designation of the site of Sodom and its neighbours as “cities of the hollow.” (ii.) The particular portion of this “hollow” which suffered from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, that namely “on the way to Zoar.” (iii.) The particulars concerning Lot’s sojourn, that he “journeyed in the east,” and pitched “as far as Sodom.” (iv.) The point of view from which Lot looked upon this “hollow of the Jordan,” as defining the position of the place intended.

(i.) The import of the phrase “cities of the hollow.” Much here turns upon the meaning assigned to the last word **בְּכַר**, which the Authorized Version renders “plain,” and which has been variously taken by other translators as signifying “district,” “circuit,” “circle,” or “round,” but which is rendered above “hollow.” It is a word whose origin has been regarded as very obscure, whose form is in Hebrew certainly all but unique, and whose application is withal most varied, it being used as here to denote a tract of country, as also in other places a *loaf* of bread, and a *talent* of gold, silver, etc. This latter fact should, however, rather help than hinder the unravelling of the mystery, as affording additional means of checking the soundness of any derivation which may be proposed. The view generally held by lexicographers and critics is, that **בְּכַר** is an anomalous form, produced by reduplication from **כָּרַר**, “to encircle, or move in circuit” (Fürst), in the same way as **בְּבֶל**, “Babel,” is formed (?) from **בָּלַל**, “to confound.” Its signification may therefore be either, 1, the district *round* any place; or, 2, a district of *circular* shape; or, 3, a winding *circling* district; in each of which senses it has been taken by one or another as applying to the valley of the Jordan. Its use as a name for loaves and talents is explained as arising from their (assumed) circular shape. But it should be observed that this verb, **כָּרַר**, is after all itself but a derivative from another and older root, **כָּרַ**, or **כָּר**, “to cut, cleave, or dig” (Fürst). This root, though not used (with one exception, Psalm xxii. 17) in this its primitive form in Hebrew, yet appears plainly in a large number of derivatives, e.g., **כָּרָה**, “to dig,” **כָּרַת**, “to cut off,” **חֹפֵר**, “a ploughman,” **כָּבַר**, “to cut, lay open, or inquire,” **חָקַר**, “to

sense (see Gen. ii. 8; iii. 24; xi. 2; xii. 8; Isaiah ix. 12; Zech. xiv. 4; comp. also the parallel **כְּצִיר**, “beside.”) For the substitution of “hollow” for “plain” (Authorized Version), see above in the text.

pierce," **חָקַר**, "to search, or investigate," **נָקַר**, "to pierce," **קָוַר**, "to dig." It is also found in Sanskrit as *khur*, or *kār*, "to cut asunder, or divide into pieces" (see Fürst's *Concord.*, sub. v., **כָּוַר**). From it are derived without doubt the Greek *χωρα*, "a place,"=a spot cut off (in idea) by itself, and the Hebrew **כֹּר**, "a measure,"=that whereby a portion is taken or distributed; from it also this secondary verb, **כָּרַר**, "to encircle," i.e., to go round a place, and so cut or mark it off (see Fürst, sub. v., **כָּרַר**). If **כָּוַר** then be thus the primitive root, why not derive **כָּרַר** directly from it, instead of through the intervention of the secondary verb, **כָּרַר**? The derivation from **כָּוַר**, though still peculiar, is indeed if anything rather easier than that from **כָּרַר**, as instead of one doubtful parallel, we have two tolerably certain ones, viz., the word **פִּטְטָה**, "circlet," from the Arabic **طَوَّاه**, "to encircle" (see Kalisch on Exod. xiii. 9), and the word **כָּבַב**, "star," from the Sanskrit and Persian *cubh*, or *khub*, "to shine" (see Fürst, sub. v., **כָּבַב**). Now if this be the true derivation of **כָּרַר**, its meaning is apparent at once; it is that which is "cut, cleft, or dug out." Applied in its most general sense, it will be a *piece* of anything, that which is separated away from the rest, in which way would be explained its use for a loaf or talent, i.e., a *piece* of bread, or *piece* of money; precisely the most natural term that could possibly be applied to them in primitive times, and, as will be seen, quite independent of any imaginary shape they may have had. Applied geographically it would mean either, 1, a tract of country, if taken still in its general sense; or, 2, if taken in its more special sense, a place cut out, cleft, or dug, i.e., a pit, ravine, or hollow. No one who looks at the restricted and distinctive use of the word **כָּרַר** geographically, can hesitate to decide that if it be, as is suggested, a derivative from **כָּוַר**, it must carry with it this narrower and more special meaning, rather than the general. It remains now, therefore, to decide between this proposed signification, a "pit, ravine, or hollow," and the generally accepted one of an "encircling, circular, or winding tract of country." And to do this we must briefly review the various places where **כָּרַר** occurs in a geographical sense.

Omitting those passages immediately under consideration, where it is admitted on all hands that it denotes the Jordan valley, but which part of that valley is disputed, we have but

five places left to be considered, which afford us the following hints :—1st. It is on one occasion used absolutely, without any name of place attached, yet certainly not of the Jordan valley : 2 Sam. xviii. 23, where Ahimaaz is said to have run by “the way of the כְּכָר” to carry the news of Absalom’s defeat to David. David was then at Mahanaim, some twenty miles east of the Jordan, the valley of which is therefore, as already remarked, here quite out of the question. But it follows further from the absolute use of כְּכָר in this place, that it cannot signify the “surrounding tract of country,” since that, with no central place named or hinted at, would plainly be devoid of sense.⁴ It might be of course a “winding way” or “circle” by which Ahimaaz ran (though neither of them would likely be a very near cut), or it might be very naturally one of the many “ravines” or “hollow ways” of the district. 2nd. It is applied to the Jordan valley, not only at its southern end, where the hills fall back on each side, and leave a wide circular plain (whence, it is thought by some, the name כְּכָר), but also to portions of the valley further north, where no such appearance suggestive of the name in this sense is to be found. 1 Kings vii. 46, “In the כְּכָר of the Jordan did the king cast them (*i. e.*, the brazen vessels), in the clay ground between Succoth and Zarthan” (so also 2 Chron. iv. 17). That the place thus defined lay north of the wide part of the valley by Jericho, appears from the fact that in 1 Kings iv. 12, “Zartanah” (=Zarthan) is given as a place in the neighbourhood of Beth-shean (the modern Beisân) and Jezreel, probably therefore some thirty miles north of the broad tract by Jericho. Succoth also, it may be noted, the other place named, is assigned in Joshua xiii. 27 to Gad, the centre one of the trans-jordanic tribes, not to Reuben, the most southerly. The term כְּכָר, then, plainly applies not to any particular part of the Jordan valley, but to the whole, and cannot therefore mean a district of circular shape. 3rd. It is applied in Neh. xii. 28 (probably also iii. 22) to some district in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, “the כְּכָר round about Jerusalem.” Here again it plainly cannot mean merely the encircling district, which would be tautological, as if one would say, “the environs round about London;” had this been the sense the word קְרִיבוֹת, “round about,” would certainly have been omitted as unnecessary. It might, however, mean the

⁴ It is to be noted that De Wette, who elsewhere constantly translates כְּכָר by “circle” or “district” (Kreis), here renders it by “brook” (Aue).

"winding" valley around the city, or still better, the same under the more appropriate and natural title of the "ravine" or "hollow." Between these two meanings, then, really lies the choice, the weight of probability inclining, however, considerably in favour of the latter. Two further considerations will assist in bringing the matter to a final decision:—1st. The term "circling," however applicable to the *river* Jordan, is very inappropriate to the valley in which it runs, one of whose most notable characteristics, especially in its southern part (to which the term כְּפָר is chiefly applied), is its *straightness*. The word כְּפָר it is scarcely necessary to remark, is invariably used of this *valley*, never of the river. It cannot then mean "circling." 2nd. The term "ravine" or "hollow," as applied to the Jordan valley, has a peculiar inherent probability about it from the fact that it is precisely parallel to the name by which the valley is called at present by the Arabs (the *Ghor*=the depression), and also to that under which it was known to Jerome and Eusebius (the *Aulon*=the ravine). That this same most truly characteristic feature of the district, its depressed, cleft, or cut-out appearance, which has given the name to it thus in later days, should also, rather than any other, have furnished its title in earlier times, and that כְּפָר therefore, like *Ghor* and *Aulon*, signifies "ravine" or "hollow," is plainly most reasonable, and in itself a powerful argument in favour of that being the true meaning of the word. On every ground, therefore, whether of etymology, geographical fitness, historical propriety, or perfect harmony with scriptural indications, it is plain that "ravine" or "hollow" is the true and only sense of the word כְּפָר as applied to a tract of country. In the case of the Jordan valley, we prefer the second of these terms, as best calculated to convey the right impression of the locality.

And now to revert from this long but necessary digression to our subject proper,—the site of Sodom and Gomorrah. They are called "the cities of the כְּפָר;" and so long as this word was interpreted as referring to the country "round" the Jordan, or the "winding" track its waters make, or the "circle" left by the retreating hills by Jericho, it certainly seemed a very strong, if not an insuperable reason for placing them at the north end of the Dead Sea, near the Jordan, instead of at the south, fifty miles off. But with the true meaning of כְּפָר this argument vanishes altogether. The "hollow of the Jordan" is so called not because the *Jordan* is its distinctive feature, but from its own intrinsic character; the word "Jordan" being merely added to prevent confusion with other similar districts,

to which, as we have seen, the same name was occasionally given. This is evident from the fact, that out of the ten places where the word is used of the Jordan valley, *four* only have the word "Jordan" added; in the other six it stands absolutely, "the hollow;" thus shewing that "Jordan" is merely the distinguishing appellative used when necessary, but "hollow" the proper title. Now it is admitted on all hands that the depression of the Jordan valley extends on a considerable distance beyond the southern end of the Dead Sea in unbroken line. There is no change in the character of the cleft until several miles below Jebel Usdum, when the ground begins to rise and gradually shut in the great ravine. The enclosing hills on each side continue from the Jordan southward in all but parallel straight lines. But what is perhaps a still more important point, the analogous names given to this ravine in more modern times, the *Aulon* of Jerome and Eusebius, the *Ghor* of the Arabs, did and do refer to the *entire valley*, without distinction, right up to the region beyond the Dead Sea. It is plainly then most reasonable to suppose that the old term "hollow," given, as we have seen, not because of the Jordan, but because of the remarkable aspect of the country itself, had the same wide significance, and included not only the valley actually traversed by the river, but also that manifest prolongation of the same, in the upper part of which lay the Dead Sea. Even if we were distinctly told, then, that Sodom and Gomorrah were situated in "the hollow of the Jordan," we should no more be obliged to conclude that this meant on the north of the Dead Sea, than to conclude that when Eusebius and Jerome state Engaddi to have been "in Aulone Hierichus," they therefore intended to place it in the immediate neighbourhood of Jericho. "Jordan," in the first case, as "Jericho," in the second, is simply an appellative to distinguish this "hollow," or this "Aulon," from others. But in truth it is never stated that Sodom and Gomorrah were in "the hollow of the Jordan," but simply that they were "cities of the hollow," that in their destruction "all the hollow" suffered also, etc.; it being a remarkable fact, that never when these cities are said to belong to the "hollow," is there any mention of the Jordan,—a fact which cannot but suggest the idea, that in truth, though in the "hollow," they were not in the neighbourhood of the Jordan; especially as it is a further fact, complementary to this, that whenever the upper part of the "hollow," where the Jordan *did* flow, is mentioned, the word "Jordan" is invariably added; it is omitted only when reference is made to these cities, or the word is used of the entire valley. The phrase, "cities of the hollow," leaves it then an open question

where along the great depression the cities stood, with a slight hint, however, that it was most probably in the part below the Jordan, and therefore south of the Dead Sea.

(ii.) We have to consider the notice as to the particular *portion* of the "hollow" which suffered from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, that namely "on the way to Zoar." The writer is describing a former fertility as contrasted with a present sterility, the result of the destruction; and lest his remark should be thought to apply to the whole valley, he defines the particular part he refers to as that "on the way to Zoar." The stand-point which he selects is doubtless that widest part of the ravine by Jericho which, as we shall have to notice presently, was the part descried by Lot when making his choice. Somewhere between this and Zoar, then, lay the doomed cities; in other words, Zoar lay either further north or further south from this point than Sodom. That the whole Pentapolis lay to the north of Jericho is out of the question, the meaning must therefore be that Zoar was the southernmost of the five; a point of importance as regards some of the later evidence to be considered further on. It should be added that a line north or south is assumed as the direction intended, inasmuch as this is the natural line of the Jordan valley.

(iii.) We have next certain particulars concerning Lot's sojourn in this "hollow," viz., that he "journeyed in the east, and pitched his tent as far as Sodom." Now, looking at the relative positions of Bethel and the Jordan valley, we cannot doubt but that Lot entered the "hollow" near by Jericho. Had we no further information concerning his movements, we might have concluded that he settled down finally in that neighbourhood, although as his choice was for "all the hollow of the Jordan," such a conclusion would have been withal somewhat hasty. But now we are distinctly told that he "journeyed" about in this eastern part of Palestine, as indeed was natural, with his large train of flocks and herds (Gen. xiii. 5—7). That Sodom was in the vicinity of Jericho we are not therefore required in any way to believe; rather indeed the contrary, since it is given as the *extreme limit* of his wanderings, "he pitched tent as far as Sodom," a remark which would certainly be more natural and likely to be made if Sodom were some considerable distance from Jericho, than if it were near at hand—in a word, if it were at the south end of the Dead Sea, rather than at the north.

(iv.) Lastly, we have to notice the point of view from which Lot looked upon this "hollow of the Jordan," as defining the position of the place intended. Lot and Abram were then in the neighbourhood of Bethel (Gen. xiii. 3, 4, comp. 18); the

part of the Jordan valley on which they looked was therefore, as already hinted, no doubt that near Jericho, inasmuch as that is the only part visible from Bethel. It is to be observed, however, that it is not said that Lot saw the cities when he looked from Bethel, but only that he saw "all the hollow of the Jordan," while that he did not remain in the one part which he then saw we have already had occasion to remark. It is to be remembered also that Lot was not then looking out for cities or fixed residence of any kind, but for pasturage for his flocks; the sight of Sodom and Gomorrah, therefore, so far from being an attraction to him, would probably have been just the reverse.

All things considered, then Gen. xiii. 10—12, while affording no conclusive evidence either way concerning the site of the five cities, yet inclines rather to the view that they were at the south end of the Dead Sea than at the north, and so tends to confirm the argument deduced from x. 19.

(c). Gen. xiv. 3, "the vale of Siddim (that is, the Salt Sea)."

Verse 7, 8, "And they smote . . . the Amorites that dwelt in Hazezon Tamar. And there went out the king of Sodom, and the king of Gomorrah, and the king of Admah, and the king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela (that is, Zoar), and joined battle with them in the vale of Siddim."

Verse 10, "And the vale of Siddim was all bitumen pits; and the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, and fell there; and they that remained fled to the mountain."

Two things are here to be considered, (i.) the description given of the "vale of Siddim;" (ii.) the particulars as to the meeting of the two armies.

(i.) The description given of the "vale of Siddim," *i.e.*, according to the majority of critics, "the vale of obstacles." The writer of this chapter tells us that it was "all bitumen pits" (lit. "bitumen pits, bitumen pits"), which his narrative shews were indeed "obstacles" of no mean description. A later editor of the chapter, explaining its many obsolete names of places, adds a note concerning this "vale of Siddim," and identifies it with the "Salt Sea," the general name in early times for what we now call the Dead Sea. Now, without entering upon the discussion of the origin and varying condition at different times of this remarkable piece of water, it will be sufficient for our purpose to notice two things, 1st, if any portion of the sea was formerly dry land, it must have been the southern; 2nd, there are facts connected with the history of the sea which make it

* The A. V. renders "slime pits;" "slime" being a word then commonly in use for "bitumen."

probable that at one time this southern portion *was* dry land. The first of these propositions arises at once from the difference of level between the two portions; the part north of the peninsula having an average depth of over 600 feet, the part south of the peninsula only 10 feet, and said, in the driest seasons, to be even fordable across its entire width. A comparatively slight diminution in the total bulk of the water (about $\frac{1}{110}$) would be sufficient therefore to leave the whole of this lagoon perfectly dry. The second proposition is based upon the facts, (1.) that at the time when the level of the sea stood some 3-400 feet higher than at present, its waters were certainly *fresh*, as is proved by the occurrence of *river shells* (such as are found at present in the Jordan), not marine, in the marly terraces along the hills, which mark the ancient beaches; (2.) that the salt mountain, whence no doubt the saltiness of the sea is derived, has certainly been *elevated* to bring it into its present position, as is proved by its having on the top (3-400 feet above the shore) a thick capping (in some places 50 feet thick) of marl and gypsum, precisely similar to that which is found elsewhere resting immediately on the shore. Now about one-tenth of the total bulk of the sea at the present time is due to the salt that it holds in solution; that is to say, if the salt were removed, the water would be found to occupy only nine-tenths of its present bulk. Supposing then that the amount of fresh water annually discharged into the sea, and the amount of evaporation from its surface, were precisely the same as now,^f but that the salt mountain had not been elevated so as to affect the water, and the aspect of the Dead Sea would have been very different from what it is now, the whole of the lagoon being perfectly dry, and the water even in the northern part standing some 56 feet lower than at present. That such a state of things ever actually existed we have of course no proof; but that it is possible and probable is plain from the two facts insisted on above,—the sea was at one time *fresh* water, not salt; the salt mountain has come into play from being *elevated* long after its original formation.^g How exactly such a state of things coincides

^f In point of fact both would probably have been greater, the first from the greater amount of vegetation, here and elsewhere, causing more rain; the second, from the quicker evaporation which would take place from fresh water as compared with salt.

^g Some have argued, indeed, that the southern end of the lake is gradually diminishing in size, by being silted up with the detritus brought into it by the various streams and winter torrents along its margin. Such detritus cannot however clearly affect in any way the *bulk* of the water, but can only by occupying its place raise the general level, and so tend to make the sea appear larger, not smaller, than before. The great bulk of this detritus moreover falls into the *northern* part of the sea, from the Jordan, where also the sides are steepest, and so a rise in level least perceptible. The effect of this deposition in the bed

with the Biblical view of the fertile and well-watered land (watered, very probably, literally, "like the land of Egypt," *i.e.*, by overflow and artificial irrigation) turned into saltiness and barrenness, and in part covered by the sea, it is needless to remark upon. Suffice it to say, that if there be truth in the note on Gen. xiv. 3, which identifies the "vale of Siddim" with the salt sea, as we have seen there well may be, it follows of necessity that this "vale of Siddim" corresponded with the south end of the Dead Sea, not the north. And this is further confirmed by the mention, this time by the original writer, of "bitumen pits" as abounding in the "vale of Siddim." There is no trace of any such upon the shore at present, either to the north or to the south; masses of bitumen still however occasionally rise in the sea, and so far as we have exact information, mainly or only in its southern portion.

The "vale of Siddim" being thus at the south end of the Dead Sea, we have to consider (ii.) the particulars as to the meeting of the two armies. The host of Chedorlaomer and his allies had swept through the countries bordering on the southern end of the "hollow," most likely, as already hinted, for the purpose of cutting off from the rebel kings the succour and the place of retreat which these might otherwise have afforded them. This done, they approached the cities themselves. The last point mentioned in the invaders' course is Hazezon Tamar, *i.e.*, Engedi (see 2 Chron. xx. 2); directly they arrived at which place, it would seem, the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, etc., "went out" to repel their attack, the scene of the battle being the "vale of Siddim." The natural conclusion from this of course is that the "vale of Siddim" lay between Engedi and Sodom. Now Engedi was undoubtedly situated at the modern Ain Jidy (the same name in fact), a notable oasis of vegetation about midway on the western shores of the Dead Sea. Granting then that the "vale of Siddim" corresponds to the present lagoon, then dry land, and every condition of the narrative is fulfilled at once if Sodom and Gomorrah stood at the south end of the sea. The descent into the "hollow" by Engedi was precisely the natural climax of the strategetic course already followed,—first cut off their succour and retreat on all sides, and then, turning suddenly in upon them from the north, drive them back upon those very mountains just before scoured by the invaders; the very result that in fact occurred. Place Sodom and Gomorrah, on the contrary, at the north, and not only are we

of the sea must be, therefore, not to diminish, but slightly to enlarge the size of the southern lagoon. The continually increasing saltiness of the water will of course still further aid in producing the same result.

obliged to imagine a further northward march after the capture of Engedi, of which there is no trace in the narrative, but the whole campaign becomes meaningless and obscure, there being then no apparent reason why all these other tribes should have been smitten, far removed from Sodom as in that case they would be, before the main object of the invasion was attempted.

(*d*). Gen. xviii. 16, "And the men rose up from thence, and looked towards Sodom; and Abraham went with them to bring them on the way."

Verse 22, "And the men turned from thence, and went towards Sodom: but Abraham stood yet before Jehovah."

Verse 33, "And Jehovah departed when he had finished speaking with Abraham: and Abraham returned to his place."

Gen. xix. 27, 28, "And Abraham went up early in the morning to the place where he stood before Jehovah; and he looked towards Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the hollow, and beheld, and lo smoke went up from the country like the smoke of a furnace."

Abraham was at this time at Mamre, *i. e.*, Hebron, (chap. xviii. 1). The place from which he beheld the smoke rising from Sodom was not however Hebron itself, but, as is plainly stated in the passages just cited, some spot on the road from thence to Sodom. The question arises, whether there is in fact any such spot, somewhat to the east of Hebron, where the Dead Sea, or at all events the hollow in which the Dead Sea lies, is visible; and if so, whether it be its northern or southern end which is so visible. Now about three miles east of Hebron there is a notable eminence called at present Beni Na'im, where according to the Mohammedans is the tomb of Lot, of the view from which Dr. Robinson thus writes:—"From the roof of the mosque at Beni Na'im we had an extensive view on every side, especially towards the east and south. The mountains beyond the Dead Sea were very distinct; but the sea itself was not visible except through gaps in the western mountains, by which the eye could penetrate into its deep bosom. One of these was said to be near the pass of Ain Jidy; and through another further south, we could perceive what appeared to be a large sand-bank in the sea." (*Bib. Res.*, vol. ii., p. 188, edit. 1841.) Here is every condition of the Scripture statement exactly fulfilled; for it is not said that Abraham *saw* Sodom and Gomorrah, it is merely implied that he saw enough to know precisely where they were; and that, according to Dr. Robinson, he plainly could from Beni Na'im. But further, Dr. Robinson clearly intends us to understand that it is the *south* end of the Dead Sea which is especially visible from this point, rather than the

north, of which he takes no notice here whatever. In the south therefore, most probably, lay those cities towards which Abraham looked.⁴

Once more, it is to be noted, that Beni Na'im lying, as it does, E.N.E. of Hebron, if the doomed cities stood at the north end of the Dead Sea, the route thither would be very nearly in the same direction which the men had already gone in leaving Abraham's tent; if on the other hand these cities were at the south, they would have to turn off from their former route very sharply. The text informs us that having arrived at this spot "the men *turned* from thence, and went towards Sodom;" another hint in favour of its southern position, and a remarkable instance, if this be admitted, of the minute accuracy of the narrative.

(e). Gen. xix. 15. "And when the morning dawned, then the angels hastened Lot," etc.

Verse 17. "And it came to pass, when they had brought them forth abroad, that he said, Escape for thy life; look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the hollow; escape to the mountain, lest thou be consumed."

Verses 19, 20. "I cannot escape to the mountain, lest some evil take me and I die. Behold, I pray thee, this city, near to flee unto, and it is a little one: oh, let me escape thither."

Verses 22, 23. "Therefore the name of the city was called Zoar (i.e. "little"). And the sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar."

Verse 30. "And Lot went up out of Zoar, to dwell in the mountain."

Several points of detail are here given as to the site of Sodom. (i.) It was at some considerable distance from the mountains; since it was plainly on account of this distance that Lot entreated not to be obliged to flee thither. (ii.) Zoar also was in the "hollow," and some distance from the mountains; since Lot chose it by preference, and subsequently "went up" from Zoar into the mountain.⁵ (iii.) Zoar lay *between* Sodom and the mountain; since it was while fleeing to the latter that Lot came upon it. (iv.) Zoar was tolerably *near* to Sodom; since the flight thither took place during the short time of morning twilight. The full bearing of these facts upon the question

⁴ Mr. Tristram's statement that the south end of the Dead Sea would have been undiscernible to Abraham (*Land of Israel*, p. 361) supposes him to have been at Hebron itself when he took his view (comp. *Ibid.*, p. 398), which is contrary to the Biblical narrative.

⁵ This at once negatives the argument commonly built upon this part of the history, that Zoar must have been on the eastern side of the Dead Sea, because that was the country of Moab, Lot's son. The mountain cave may indeed have been on the east, but that Zoar also was so by no means follows.

under discussion must be reserved until we have further elucidated the exact position of Zoar, the surviving city, to which we now proceed to address ourselves.

(f). Deut. xxxiv. 3. "And the south, and the hollow, the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, as far as Zoar."

This is the description of the southern part of Moses' view from Mount Nebo. Sweeping round from right to left, his glance had taken in the whole of the promised land from the land of Gilead, that lay due N., as far as the distant Dan; passing on to the district of Naphtali, on the N.N.W.; then to the wide regions of Ephraim and Manasseh, on the N.W. and W.N.W.; then across Judah, as far as the Mediterranean Sea, on the W. and W.S.W.; now at last terminating on the S.W. and S.S.W., with the "Negeb," or south country, bordering on the wilderness, and due S. with the great "hollow" traced down from Jericho to Zoar. This seems the natural meaning of the passage, and of course requires that Zoar should be the furthest point due S. within the promised land visible from Mount Nebo. The view here described is no ideal of the imagination, but one really to be seen from the heights in question: the site of Zoar is therefore a matter easily to be settled by observing how far due south the hollow can be traced from them. If only as far as the mouth of the Jordan, then of course Zoar stood at the north of the Dead Sea; if right to the end of the Sea, then of course Zoar stood at the south; if only part way down, then Zoar stood part way down. On this point Mr. Tristram thus writes, beginning his description from the opposite end to that in Deuteronomy, and first noting (which is omitted there) certain points without the promised land which are also visible from Nebo. "As the eye turned southwards towards the line of the ridge on which we were clustered, the peak of Jebel Shihân just stood out behind Jebel Attarus, which opened to reveal to us the situation of Kerak, though not its walls. Beyond and behind these, sharply rose Mounts Hor and Seir, and the rosy peaks of Arabia faded away into the distance towards Akabah. Still turning westwards, in front of us, two or three lines of terraces reduced the height of the plateau as it descended to the Dead Sea, the western outline of which we could trace, in its full extent, from Usdum to Feshkah. It lay like a long slip of molten metal, with the sun mirrored on its surface, waving and undulating in its farther edge, unseen in its eastern limits, as though poured from some deep cavern beneath our feet. There, almost in the centre of the line, a break in the ridge, and a green spot below, marked Engedi, the nest once of the Kenite, now of the wild goat." (*Land of Israel*, pp. 537-8). This is conclusive. The southern view of the hol-

low reaches to the "full extent" of the Dead Sea, even up to the salt mountain Usdum. Zoar, then, which marked the limit of Moses' view in this direction, must clearly have been at the south end of the sea, not the north. But to this it is objected, that, on the contrary, Zoar is here distinctly connected with Jericho; A.V. "the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar."—It is strange that writers using this argument should never have seen the anomalous character of the description thus given. The כֶּכֶר of the *valley* of Jericho,—well, whatever sense is put upon כֶּכֶר it is equally strange; the "circle of the valley," the "environs of the valley," the "winding way of the valley;" the "plain of the valley;"—in each case "valley" is plainly redundant, or else destroys the reference to the Ghor altogether. It is the same or worse if כֶּכֶר be rendered "hollow." Under these circumstances it would have been worth while to have looked a little more minutely at the original, where it would have been found that the Masorites, when accenting the passage, instead of joining "hollow" with "valley," distinctly *disjoined* them, reading as above "the hollow, the valley" (so also De Wette and Benisch). Then all is plain enough, the "valley of Jericho" marking the upper and near part of the "hollow" seen by Moses, "Zoar" the lower and most distant, in exactly the same way as Gilead and Dan on the north, and Judah and the Mediterranean on the west.¹ This mention of Zoar as the southern limit of Moses' prospect would also lead us to prefer a due south or south-western site for it, rather than a south-eastern, as in the latter case, though still a proper boundary, it would not itself have been visible, which the tenor of the passage would lead us to conclude it was.

(g). Isaiah xv. 5, 6. "My heart crieth out for Moab; his fugitives are as far as Zoar, Eglath-shalishiya; for the ascent of Lubith—with weeping they ascend it; for in the way of Horonaim they raise up a cry of sorrow. For the waters of Nimrim are desolate."

¹ It has been taken for granted here that "city of palm-trees" is an epithet applied to Jericho, as was evidently the view of the Masorites when accenting the passage. This name is also certainly applied to Jericho in 2 Chron. xxviii. 15. The use of such an epithet in this place is however unlikely; and the thought hence suggests itself that perhaps it does not refer to Jericho at all, but to some other place along the hollow, between it and Zoar; and if so, most probably to Engedi, a notable object in the view (see Tristram, above), and whose name at that time, Hazezon Tamar (=the felling of palm-trees), would well accord with the title here given. There can be little doubt at all events, but that "city of palm-trees" in Jud. i. 16, iii. 13, denotes Engedi and not Jericho, which latter at this time lay desolate. If this be so, of course the mention of Engedi as between Jericho and Zoar, is a further confirmation of the latter's southern position.

Jer. xlviii. 34. "From crying Heshbon as far as Elealeh, as Jahaz, have they uttered their voice; from Zoar as far as Horonaim, Eglath-shalishiya. For the waters also of Nimrim are desolate."^{*}

In each of these places Zoar is mentioned as belonging to Moab, and is coupled with certain other places, Luhith, Horonaim, Eglath-shalishiya, Nimrim, some or all of which we may suppose, therefore, were in its neighbourhood. Only one of these has, however, been identified, Nimrim, which Mr. Tristram believes to have found in the "Ghor-en-N'meirah," a notable valley with perennial stream which flows into the Dead Sea near its southern end. If this be correct, of course it follows that Zoar was most probably at the south also. Others, however, identify Nimrim with the Wady Nimrîn, some ten miles north of the Dead Sea, which is however more probably the Beth-Nimrah of Num. xxxii. 36, Josh. xiii. 27, which certainly lay in that direction. This doubtfulness of the identification of Nimrim with N'meirah, makes it of course impossible to found any direct argument for the southern position of Zoar on these passages in the Prophets. Indirectly, however, they are of considerable importance. They define Zoar to be a city of Moab; if then Zoar stood at the north of the Dead Sea, it must plainly have been on the east side of the Jordan, and therefore in the territory formerly belonging to Sihon, king of Heshbon. Now this territory was assigned by Moses to the tribes of Reuben and Gad, and in Numb. xxxii. 34—42, Josh. xiii. 16—27, are lists of the various towns within this territory which they possessed or built. Among these are Heshbon, Elealeh, Kiriathaim, Nebo, Baal-meon, Sibmah, Jazer, Medeba, Aroer, Dibon, Jahaz and Mephaath, which are mentioned by Isaiah and Jeremiah as in their days belonging to Moab. Had Zoar then lain in this part of the Moabitish territory we should certainly have expected to find it also included in the list of Reubenite or Gadite towns, especially as Deut. xxxiv. 3 shews it to have been well known at the time. Its omission may be taken therefore as a tolerably clear proof that it lay in that part of Moab south of the Arnon, which the Moabites had not been dispossessed of by the Amorites, and in whose possession they were left undisturbed by Moses,—that is to say, it lay at least half-way down the Dead Sea. The similar omission of Horonaim, Luhith, Eglath-shalishiya, and, probably, Nimrim, with which Zoar is coupled by the Prophets, would lead us to assign these also to the district south of the Arnon; an inference which is of value, as helping us to identify the Zoar of Moses

^{*} The A.V. translates "Eglath-shalishiya" in both places—"an heifer of three years old," but it seems more probably the name of a place.

not only with the Zoar of the prophets, but also with the Zoar of Josephus and other ancient writers, whose testimony we have next to consider.

II. *The statements of ancient writers, viz., of Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, and a few mediæval travellers.*

(a) JOSEPHUS.—He tells us that the ancient Zoar still existed in his days under the same name (*Ant.*, i. 11, § 4), and that it was at the *further* end of the Asphaltic Lake, in Arabia (*B.J.* iv. 8, § 4), enumerating it also in another place (*Ant.*, xiv. 1, § 4) among a list of Arabian towns, in immediate juxtaposition with "Orone" (= Horonaim), thus further identifying it with the Zoar of the prophets, and fixing the latter's southern site.

(b) EUSEBIUS AND JEROME.—These writers are also very distinct in their testimony. From the *Onomasticon* we learn that the Dead Sea extended from Jericho to Zoar (art. *Θαλασσα η αλυκη*), which latter place lay close to its shores (art. *Βαλα*): that "Luith" in Moab lay between Areopolis (= Rabbath Moab) and Zoar (art. *Λουειθ*), again agreeing with the southern position of the latter and Luith, deduced above from Isaiah and Jeremiah; that the village Benamerium, which they identify with Nimrim, was to the *north* of Zoar (art. *Νεμριμ*), which would place Zoar farther south than N'meirah (supposing this to be the same place), or quite at the end of the sea. Further, in his commentary on Isaiah xv. 5, Jerome says that Zoar lay "in the borders of the Moabites, dividing them from the land of the Philistines," *i. e.* from Palestine. While in his account of Paula's travels, he describes how when leaving Hebron she came to the height of *Caphar Berucha*, the spot where Abraham stood before the Lord, and thence looked out upon the wide desert, the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the regions of Engaddi and Zoar (*Epist.* cviii., § 11). A description agreeing exactly with that of Dr. Robinson cited above, and proving most conclusively that Jerome understood Zoar to be at the south end of the sea.

(c) MEDIÆVAL TRAVELLERS.—Speaking of the crusaders' expedition in this neighbourhood A.D. 1100, Fulcher says, that "having circled round the lake at its southern end, on the road from Hebron to Petra," they "found there a large village which was said to be Segor," *i. e.* Zoar. From this it has been argued that Zoar must have stood in the Wady-ed-Dra'ah, a valley rather less than one-fourth way up on the eastern side, this being the ordinary road from the south of the Dead Sea to the eastern highlands. But inasmuch as the march of the crusaders was towards Petra, *i. e.*, not to the east, but to the south, it is far more probable that they followed the route adopted by Dr.

Robinson when making this same journey "from Hebron to Petra," i.e. straight along the Arabah up Wady-el-Jeib; in which case of course Zoar must have been due S., or slightly S.W. of the end of the lake. Brocardus (about A.D. 1290) says, on hearsay, that Segor was situated "five leagues to the south of Jericho, beneath the mountain of Engaddi, between which mountain and the Dead Sea is the statue of salt." Here are no doubt errors both of distance and position, but so far as it goes it confirms the southern or south-western situation of Zoar. To this concord of statements there is however one remarkable exception, if indeed the confused account of Thietmar (A.D. 1217) can be considered worthy of being ranked as such. His route is as follows:—he crosses the Jordan at the usual fords, and arrives at "the field and the spot where the Lord overthrew Sodom and Gomorra;" on the shore of the lake, about a mile from the place of our Lord's baptism (i.e., from the fords), he sees "the statue of salt into which Lot's wife was turned;" coming from the lake he arrives at Segor; then he passes the vineyard of Benjamin and of Engaddi, and next enters the mountain land of Moab, leaving the plains of Shittim on the left. Any one who will follow this route on a map, whatever his opinion may be as to the site of Sodom, will see how utterly inexplicable and indeed impossible it is; how worthless therefore as evidence. Several other writers mention Zoar, some indeed calling the sea after it, but not in a way which can assist in defining its position (see Smith's *Dict.*, art. Zoar, and Robinson's *Bib. Res.*, vol. ii. note 34, at end). We pass on therefore to consider our last group of evidence.

III. *The names given to the localities in question by the Arabs at the present day.* This matter is soon settled. At the north end there are no names now prevalent which at all resemble those of any of the cities. M. de Saulcy's "Goumran," plausible as it looks, being really very different from the Hebrew "Gomorrah" (עַמֹּרָה) which might be better represented in English as "Amorrah." On the east there is one name "Dra'ah," the valley below Kerak, which might possibly be a corruption of Zoar. On the south are three names, that of the salt-mountain "Usdum" perhaps a later form of Sodom (more strictly S'dom סֹדֹם); "Zoghal," a well-marked but small site close beside it on the northern side, all but identical with Zoar; and "Amrah," a wady in the same neighbourhood, but more to the west, identical with Gomorrah. That the places now bearing these names are not the original sites of the cities in question may be admitted at once; they would not satisfy the conditions of the Biblical and other statements just considered. Still the fact that three

out of the five names yet linger at this one corner of the sea, is a not inconsiderable argument that somewhere thereabouts stood, according to old hereditary tradition, the cities themselves.

Lastly, it is not to be overlooked, that in this same quarter stands the salt-mountain, whose remarkable property of splitting up into columnar and fantastic-shaped fragments may perhaps be connected with the statement that Lot's wife "became a pillar of salt," as it doubtless is with the traditions concerning this pillar in later times; that here also, in the Wady Mahawat, are the only signs discoverable so far, which can be thought to indicate the occurrence of any such catastrophe as that which brought about the destruction of Sodom. (See Tristram's *Land of Israel*, pp. 354-9).

Looking back now over the whole evidence, there can be no doubt as to the conclusion to be deduced from it. On behalf of the northern site of Sodom there has appeared no tittle of proof whatever, not even a hint. On behalf of the southern site has appeared proof the most conclusive, diverse, and unanimous. It will be well, however, in order to remind the reader how varied and harmonious the proof is, briefly to sum this evidence up. We have found then,

1. That Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, were to the south of Callirrhoë (I. a);
2. That they were situated in the hollow of the Jordan, but most probably not in that part actually traversed by it (I. b i.);
3. That of all the cities Zoar was the furthest removed from Jericho, the furthest south (I. b ii.);
4. That Sodom was probably some distance from Jericho, as forming the extreme limit of Lot's sojourning (I. b iii.);
5. That the cities were not, it would seem, within sight of Bethel, therefore not at the north (I. b iv.);
6. That in their immediate neighbourhood was the "vale of Siddim," corresponding, it would seem, with the present southern lagoon (I. c i.);
7. That this "vale of Siddim" lay between them and Engedi, whence it follows that they were to the south of it (I. c ii.);
8. That the land where they stood was discernible from a spot to the east of Hebron, though themselves were not, which agrees exactly with their southern position (I. d, II. b);
9. That in proceeding to Sodom from this spot, after leaving Hebron, a turn had to be made in the line of road, which would scarcely be the case had they been in the north (I. d);
10. That Sodom and Zoar were both at a considerable distance from the mountains, Zoar being however slightly the nearer of the two (I. e i.—iii.);

11. That Sodom and Zoar were near together (I. e iv.);

12. That Zoar was the farthest point south, along the hollow, visible from Mount Nebo, at least therefore as far south as Jebel Usdum, and probably rather on the west side of the hollow than the east (I. f);

13. That Zoar was in later times a city of Moab, probably in the neighbourhood of Nimrim, i.e. most likely N'meirah, a stream entering the Dead Sea on the S.E. (I. g);

14. That Zoar was in that part of Moab that lay south of the river Arnon (I. g);

15. That Zoar was at the further end of the Dead Sea (II. a);

16. That Zoar was on the southern shore of the Dead Sea, south of Nimrim, and in the borders of Moab (II. b);

17. That Zoar was on the road from Hebron to Petra, at the south of the Dead Sea, and in the neighbourhood of Engedi (II. c);

18. That names similar to, or identical with Sodom, Gomorrah and Zoar, still linger at the S.W. corner of the sea, where also are the only existing local indications of the catastrophe (III).

To enforce the general conclusion arising out of these several items is quite unnecessary; they speak for themselves. Sodom and its neighbours must certainly have been at the south of the Dead Sea; but can we fix their site more precisely? Our only hope lies in Zoar, the one concerning which we have at once the fullest, the exactest, and the most varied evidence. It has been commonly identified with the Wady ed-Dra'ah leading up to Kerak: this is however opposed to the evidence in many particulars (see 3, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16). Against the far more probable Zoghal it may be urged, that it is hardly far south enough for 3, 12, 15, 16, too near the mountains for 10, and too far west for 13. Leaving existing names out of the account altogether then, we may say that the most probable site would be somewhere a little to the south-east of Usdum, not very far probably from the Ain el-Beida; but nearer than this it seems impossible to determine. With respect to the other cities, they were all no doubt to the north of Zoar (see 3, 10), and it is by no means improbable that the sites of some at least are now covered by the waters of the lagoon. That they were destroyed by submergence, we have indeed not the slightest reason to imagine; but if the views suggested above as to the intrusion of salt into the sea (at the time probably of the catastrophe) be correct (see above, I. c i.), it is quite likely that they may at some subsequent time have become overflowed.

GEORGE WARINGTON.

**THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS TESTED BY
AN EXAMINATION OF THEIR CONTENTS.**

BY THE REV. C. A. ROW.

(Continued from Vol. VIII., page 373.)

HERE follow several narratives, unconnected with discourses. We have already considered the threefold account of the miracle at Jericho; according to Luke, immediately after performing this miracle, our Lord passed through Jericho, and was entertained by Zaccheus. In close connection with this entertainment, Luke places the parable of the pounds. The anointing of Jesus is mentioned by Matthew, Mark, and John. It is told by the two former out of its proper place, owing to its bearing on the betrayal of our Lord. The three accounts present us with the following striking differences and similarities. Matthew and Mark state that it occurred at a feast, in the house of Simon the leper, at Bethany; while John tells us that our Lord arrived at Bethany six days before the passover. He does not state that the feast was in Simon's house, nor does he assert that it took place in that of Lazarus. But he says that there (*i. e.*, in Bethany) they made him a feast, and *Martha served*, but Lazarus was one of those reclining with him. Matthew and Mark tell us that a woman came, having an alabaster box of ointment. Mark calls the mixture "liquid or genuine nard" (*πιστικῆς νάρδου*). John says that Mary took a pound weight of liquid or genuine nard (*πιστικῆς*). Matthew uses, to denote the value of it, the word *βαρυτίμου*; Mark, *πολυτελοῦς*; John, *πολυτίμου*. Mark says, "Breaking the alabaster, she poured it on his head." Matthew omits the former circumstance, and John says, "She anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment." Matthew says the disciples—Mark, some—were indignant (*ἠγανάκτησαν*), saying, For what purpose is this waste? for (Matthew) the ointment might have been sold for much, and given to the poor." Mark varies by introducing the exact sum, 300 denaria, and adds, They murmured against her (*ἐνεβριμῶντο*). But John names Judas Iscariot as the murmurer, mentions the supposed value, and charges him with peculation. Matthew and Mark represent our Lord's observations as addressed to the disciples: John specifically to Judas. In Matthew and Mark the words are nearly the same. "Why do you afford trouble to the woman? She has wrought a good work on me, for you have the poor always with yourselves

(μεθ' ἑαυτῶν), but me you have not always." To this Mark makes two additions, "When you wish, you are able to do them good." "She has done what she could." Matthew, "For she, pouring this ointment on my body, has done it for my burial" (πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι με). Mark, "She has come beforehand to anoint my body to the burial" (εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν). Then both in the same words, "Verily I say unto you, Wherever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, also this which she has done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her." All this is represented in John by the words, "Against the day of my burial has she kept this, *for the poor you always have with you* (μεθ' ἑαυτῶν), but me ye have not always."

The three accounts present several indications of distinctness of origin; John's pre-eminently so. At the same time we cannot help being struck with several similarities of expression, which prove that in its present form it must have grown out of a single document in the Greek language. John's Gospel must have been composed not less than fifteen or twenty years after the latest of the other two—probably considerably more—yet we notice in it several verbal expressions identical with Mark. Both of them use the peculiar word πιστικῆς, to signify genuine or fluid nard. This word is omitted by Matthew. At the same time, each evangelist uses a different word to denote "very precious." Mark and John also mention the express value, 300 denaria. No less remarkable is the fact that all three evangelists have used the phrase (μεθ' ἑαυτῶν) to denote "with you" in the sentence, "the poor you always have with you," etc. It is quite inconceivable that three independent writers, one of whom is separated from the other two by an interval of at least fifteen or twenty years, should have used Greek words so unusual, unless our Lord had actually uttered the words in Greek, or they had had them impressed on their minds by the use of a common translation, or from their having become current by frequent repetition. But while we have these indications that the story had become fixed in a settled form of words in the Greek language, before either Gospel was written, it no less proves that each writer, to a considerable extent, told it in his own words. If John's Gospel were written by the Apostle, his account would be an independent one. Accordingly, we find in this Gospel such a variation in narrating the facts as we might expect. While Matthew and Mark tell us expressly that the feast was held in the house of Simon the leper, John leaves the place indefinite. He distinctly specifies that Lazarus was one of the guests, and Martha served at—or, perhaps, provided—the entertainment. While Matthew and Mark mention only

a woman, he definitely tells us that Mary anointed our Lord's feet, wiped them with her hair, and that the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. While Matthew and Mark inform us that the disciples murmured; John specifically names Judas. Nothing was more likely than if he commenced murmuring, that the others would join in it. Some person doubtless took the lead on the occasion. Matthew and Mark again follow the same account of the words used by the disciples; John a different one. So also with respect to our Lord's observations. John's account is much abridged compared with the others, being evidently intended to express the general sense. The identity of words used by Matthew and Mark prove that they must have been derived from a common Greek source. Had they translated independently of each other, it would have been impossible that their Greek could have preserved so close a resemblance, both in words and phrases. Part of those words had become so generally impressed on the minds of the Christian community, that they have been used by John even while he meant only to record the substance of what our Lord said, which he does in the expression, "Against the day of my burying hath she kept this."

While the phenomena, as they stand in Matthew and Mark, prove that they must have used the same written account, the small verbal variations in them are evidence that they did not actually copy from it when each wrote his Gospel. The variations, however, might possibly have been introduced by dictation, or, if the words of the account had been deeply imprinted on their memories, might be the result of writing them down, with an occasional reference to a written document. The variations are as follows:—Mark adds that the woman came "as he was reclining" (τοῦ κατακειμένου). Matthew uses a slightly different word to denote this (τοῦ ἀνακειμένου), and places it after the statement that she poured the ointment on our Lord's head. While Mark simply says the woman came (ἦλθε), Matthew says (προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ) came up to him. Matthew calls the liquid ointment. Mark adds, "of genuine nard." The one denotes its value by πολυτίμου, the other by βαρυτίμου. Matthew says, The disciples, seeing it, were indignant; Mark, But there were some feeling indignation in themselves. To the expression, "For what purpose is this waste?" Mark adds, "of the ointment made;" Matthew says, "might have been sold for much;" Mark, "about three hundred denaria," and adds, "they murmured against her." He also adds to our Lord's reply, "Let her alone," the same word being used by John, only in the singular number. He further makes the

addition to our Lord's words, "and whenever you are willing, you are able to do them good." Instead of the expression in Matthew, "She pouring the ointment on my body," Mark has, "she has done what she could;" and instead of the expression, "she has done it in reference to burying me," "she has come beforehand to anoint my body for the burial." These singular variations seem impossible to be assigned to deliberate purpose, and must have come about in some one of the ways we have before suggested.

St. John's description of our Lord's entrance into Jerusalem presents similar phenomena. It is evidently an account quite distinct from that of the synoptics. It is intended to be a brief summary of an event which the writer intended to notice, but did not purpose particularly to describe. The synoptical account is particularly distinct, and from the sameness of the words employed in it, the three accounts present unequivocal evidence of having been derived from a common origin.

Matthew has, "When they approached to Bethany, and were come to Bethphage, unto the Mount of Olives," Mark slightly varies, "And when they are approaching to Jerusalem, towards Bethany and Bethphage, at the Mount of Olives;" Luke, "When he approached to Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount called the Mount of Olives." Matthew, "Then Jesus sent two disciples;" Mark and Luke, "he sent two of his disciples." Matthew, "saying" (*λέγων*), Mark, and "he says to them" (*λέγει*), Luke, "saying" (*εἶπον*), Matthew, "Go" (*Πορεύθητε*). Mark, "Go" (*Υπάγετε*) into the village which is opposite to you." Luke, "Go" (*Υπάγετε*) into the opposite village;" Matthew, "And immediately you shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her." Mark, "And immediately on entering it you shall find a colt tied, on which no man has set." Luke, "in which on entering you shall find a *colt tied*, on which no man has *ever* sat." All three, "Loose him, and bring him." Matthew, and "if any man say anything." Mark, "And if any man say, Why do you this? say." Luke, "And if any man ask you why do you this, thus shall you say to him." All three, "The Lord has need of him;" Matthew and Mark, "and immediately he will send;" Matthew, "them;" Mark, "him." Matthew, having noticed the fulfilment of a prophecy, proceeds: "And the disciples having gone and done as Jesus commanded them, brought the ass and the colt, and placed on them their clothes, and set Jesus on them." But Mark says, "they went and found the colt fastened at a door at a double road without, and they loose him." This is represented in Luke by, "Those who were sent went and found as he said to them." Mark continues, "And some of

those who stood there said to them, What do ye loosing the colt? and they said as Jesus commanded them: and they permitted them." This is slightly varied in Luke, "And while they were loosing the colt, its owners said to them, Why do you loose the colt? and they said, The Lord has need of him." Mark adds, "and they brought the colt to Jesus, and placed their clothes on it, and set him on it." Luke, "And they brought it to Jesus, and throwing their clothes on the colt, they mounted Jesus." Matthew and Mark add, with a few grammatical variations, "And a great multitude strewed their garments in the road, and others cut branches from the trees (Matthew, *κλάδους*, Mark, *στροιβάδας*), and strewed them on the road, and the multitudes who preceded and followed cried, Hosanna (Matthew, to the son of David), blessed is he that comes in the name of the Lord." But Luke gives a much more minute account. He tells us that as they were approaching the descent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples burst forth into praises. On this, certain of the Pharisees find fault. Our Lord vindicates the disciples. On approaching nearer our Lord weeps over Jerusalem, and prophesies its approaching ruin. Matthew then continues his account by describing the entering into Jerusalem, and the cleansing of the temple—which Mark places on the following day—and says, that our Lord, on the day of his entry, only took a general survey of all things, and, as soon as it was late, went to Bethany with the twelve.

Now what do the identities and variations of expression in these narratives prove as to the mode of its composition? The first inference which suggests itself is, that Luke must have had an additional source of information from whence he has derived the facts inserted by him. Had Matthew and Mark read them in any document, it is hardly possible that they could have passed them over without notice. If they used a written account, it must have been a memorandum in which these circumstances did not appear.

But are the identities of the words such as to prove that a common account either existed in writing, or was deeply impressed on the minds of the three evangelists? Identity is preserved through by far the larger portion of the narrative. The grammatical constructions vary somewhat more than usual. Not unfrequently, one word of a similar meaning is substituted for another. The phenomena presented are exactly such as we should expect to find if three persons who had deeply studied a written narrative, or had had the account so frequently repeated over that it had become deeply impressed on the memory, had

written their respective accounts from recollection. They prove that the three writers must have been familiar with the account expressed in the same Greek words, and that they could not have made separate translations of them from Aramaic.

As the account is evidently derived from a common narrative, it must have been slightly altered by Matthew or Mark to meet the case as to the animal on which our Lord rode. Mark and Luke make mention of the colt only. Now it is very possible that there might have been both an ass and a colt, and that Matthew was led specially to notice the presence of the former in reference to the fulfilment of the prophecy. But, if this were the case, Mark and Luke would not have written as they have if the common narrative had noticed the presence of the ass and colt, because it is evident that the words of our Lord and the disciples have been accommodated to the presence of the colt alone or of the ass and colt. As our Lord rode the colt, it was very natural that the presence of the ass should not have been mentioned. The notice of the ass, therefore, is an additional fact introduced by the author of this Gospel.

In the same manner Mark has introduced an additional piece of information into the common account in his notice of the exact place where the disciples found the colt, and his informing us that they were questioned respecting their conduct on the occasion. It is singular that Luke merely notices the place where the colt was tied by the expression, "And going away, those who were sent found as he said to them," while, respecting the question put to the disciples, he is more precise than Mark, for he tells us that the persons who questioned the disciples were the owners of the colt. Again, while Mark tells us that the disciples replied as Jesus commanded them, Luke is precise—"The Lord has need of him." The words in each narrative have been accommodated to suit the peculiar view of each writer respecting the facts, and the variations are just such as would arise if three writers reported a common account from memory, each writer incorporating into it an additional anecdote or two which he had heard from other narrators.

Matthew proceeds to describe our Lord's entry into Jerusalem, and the excitement with which it was attended. "And entering into Jerusalem, the whole city was excited, saying, Who is this? and the multitudes said, This is Jesus the prophet, from Nazareth of Galilee. And he entered into the temple of God, and cast out them that sold and bought in the temple," etc. Matthew then tells us that blind and lame persons resorted to him in the temple and were healed, and that when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonders which he did, and

heard the exclamations of the children, they remonstrated, and that our Lord replied, "Have you never read that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?" In the evening he withdrew to Bethany. On the morning, returning to the city, he was hungry. Noticing a fig-tree by the wayside, he goes to it and finds nothing on it but leaves, and says to it, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever," and the fig-tree withered immediately. The disciples seeing it wondered, saying, "How soon has the fig-tree withered away." Jesus answers, "Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, not only shall you do as is done in the fig-tree; but should you say to this mountain, Be taken up and cast into the sea, it shall be done, and all things whatsoever you ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive."

But Mark simply says, "He entered into the temple, and having looked round on all things, the hour being late, he went out to Bethany with the twelve. And on the morrow, when they came from Bethany, he hungered, and seeing a fig-tree with leaves, he came to it, if indeed he might find anything on it, and coming to it, he found nothing but leaves" (*οὐ γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς σὺκων*). The words of the curse are varied. Matthew, "May no fruit be from thee henceforth for ever." Mark, "May no one eat fruit of thee henceforth for ever." Mark in this place says nothing of the withering of the fig-tree, or of any observation made on it either by our Lord or the disciples, but conducts our Lord immediately to the temple. He then notices the cleansing of the temple in precisely the same words as Matthew describes the cleansing on the day before, with the addition that he did not suffer that any one should carry a vessel through the temple. On this the priests and scribes seek how they might destroy him, but are hindered from fear of the people. When it was late he goes out of the city, but returning early on the morrow, the disciples notice the fig-tree dried up from the roots. Peter draws our Lord's attention to it. Jesus' reply is, "Have faith in God. For verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be rooted up and cast into the sea, and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that the things which he says shall come to pass, there shall be to him whatever he says." To this Mark adds a short discourse on prayer.

Luke, on the day of the triumphal entry, conducts our Lord to the temple, and in the briefest manner describes the cleansing. He then adds the following general description:—"And he was teaching day by day in the temple, and the chief priests, the scribes, and the chief of the people, were seeking to destroy him, and were not finding what they might do. For

all the people hung on him, hearing him." The next notice of time in Luke is similarly vague, "And it came to pass on one of those days while he was teaching in the temple," etc. Luke omits all the other circumstances.

Now it is evident that there is some confusion in Matthew and Mark's narrative as to the day on which the particular events narrated by them happened. If we assume the correctness of the one, we necessarily admit the incorrectness of the other; for that our Lord should have cleansed the temple on two consecutive days, each cleansing being accompanied with a set of precisely similar circumstances, is incredible. But the idea is expressly excluded by Mark's narrative, who represents our Lord as looking round on all things. Now it is impossible that Mark could have known that he cleansed the temple on that day; and, instead of stating that he did so, have described him as looking round on all things, and as cleansing the temple on the following day. This would not be merely an inaccurate mode of writing, but one which was positively misleading.

Similarly also with respect to the cursing of the barren fig-tree. Matthew says that it took place the morning following the cleansing of the temple, and represents the disciples as noticing it at once, and records the words of our Lord consequent on their observation. He then conducts our Lord immediately to the temple, and describes the dialogue between him and the priests touching his authority. But Mark places this event on the morning after our Lord entered Jerusalem, and on the day of the cleansing. On the following morning he tells us that the disciples observed the fig-tree dried up, and he here places the discourse of our Lord.

Now these phenomena plainly prove that there was a variation as to the day when our Lord cleansed the temple, cursed the fig-tree, and when the disciples noticed that it was withered, in the authorities followed by Matthew and Mark. We are not here called on to determine which has arranged these events correctly, but simply to infer from the phenomena that such variation must have existed in the original authorities, and further that it is utterly impossible that either Matthew or Mark could have read each other's narrative, and have written as they have. The whole manner of Luke implies that he actually found this vagueness to exist among his authorities, and forebore to attempt to reconcile them. He has, therefore, only given us a brief account of the entry, and used words marked by their indefiniteness as to time in describing the events of the following days. His description is suitable for any one of them.

It seems, therefore, to be certain that there was a disagree-

ment among the authorities as to the day. Matthew followed one, and Mark another, and Luke left the matter open, except that he places the cleansing on the same day as the triumphant entry. But what phenomena are presented by the three evangelists as to the sameness or diversity of the words used by them in describing the same events? The words used in the description of the events prior to the actual entry into Jerusalem present a remarkable identity of expression, the only variation of the smallest importance being where Mark or Luke have introduced a new fact. So the evangelists are nearly identical in the words used in describing the acclamations with which our Lord was received. Here, however, Luke has introduced several important facts. The concluding portion of the account contains considerable verbal variations. But although Matthew and Mark place the cleansing on different days, the words in which the actual cleansing is described are nearly the same. Luke is more concise. All three evangelists ascribe nearly the same words to our Lord. Although they place the notice of the withering of the fig-tree on different days, Matthew and Mark put substantially the same words into our Lord's mouth. In Matthew's account the observation is ascribed to the disciples generally; in that of Mark, Peter is brought into prominence. Matthew represents our Lord as saying, "If you have faith and do not doubt, not only shall you do what is done in the fig-tree," etc. But Mark, "Have faith in God, for verily I say to you, Whosoever shall say to this mountain," etc. Matthew, "And all things whatsoever you shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." But Mark, "But all things whatsoever you ask in prayer, believe that you receive them, and they shall be to you." We have in each report the substance not the express words of our Lord.

Now such phenomena point to a common origin of the earlier portion of the narrative, but in the later portion its indications are less distinct, though still sufficient to prove that a common source of information must have existed.

What, then, is the legitimate inference suggested by the variations? That these narratives have been derived from different memoranda of the reports of one or more apostolic men, and that while these different memoranda preserved largely the same expressions, one of their authors made a mistake as to the day when these events occurred, and that Mark and Luke have inserted a few facts by means of additional information to which they had access. The account in Mark and Luke presents the strongest traces of an eye-witness, until we come to the latter portion of Luke's narrative.

Immediately following these events, all three evangelists narrate the dialogue between our Lord and the chief priests and scribes respecting his divine mission, but it was placed by them on such a day of the week as their views on that point rendered necessary. This dialogue is nearly word for word alike in all three evangelists. They all describe the questioners as the chief priests and elders. Mark and Luke add, the scribes. All three report their question word for word alike, "By what authority do you do these things, and who gave thee this authority?" Mark adds, "to do these things?" The answer is again word for word the same, with one or two variations so small that they may be the work of a transcriber. "I will ask you one word;" Mark, "answer me." Luke, "tell me." Matthew, "if you tell me." Matthew and Mark, "I will tell you by what authority I do these things." These words are omitted by Luke. Matthew, "Whence was the baptism of John? From heaven or of men?" Mark and Luke, "Was the baptism of John from heaven or of men?" Mark, "answer me." The answer in all three is word for word alike. "If we shall say from heaven, he will say, Why then did you not believe him? but if we shall say of men;" Matthew, "we fear;" Mark, "they feared" "the people;" Luke, "all the people will stone us;" Matthew and Mark, "for all esteem John;" Matthew, "as a prophet;" Mark, "that he was a prophet indeed;" Luke, "for they were persuaded that John was a prophet." The answer in Matthew and Mark is, "We do not know;" Luke, "they answered that they did not know." Our Lord's answer is word for word alike in all three. "Neither do I tell you on what authority I do these things."

Now it would be impossible that words thus exactly alike could have been preserved in the various churches by mere oral delivery during the years which must have elapsed before the first Gospel was written. Nor does this represent the whole of the difficulty. Whether we assume Matthew or Mark's Gospel to have been written first, it is evident that Luke's Gospel was not composed long before the Acts of the Apostles, nor earlier than the year 58. Now all the phenomena presented by this Gospel point to the conclusion that he had not read either of the other two when he composed his own. Luke, therefore, must have derived this dialogue either from a written document or from oral delivery. But the impossibility that the same words could have been preserved in a course of oral delivery during the number of years which must have elapsed before Luke published his Gospel, proves for certain that, at least in Luke's case, he must have found it in the form of a written document.

But the sameness of the words in Matthew and Mark point to a similar conclusion. It is impossible that the same words could have been preserved orally during a period of even seven years. We admit that the apostles, by the aid of the supernatural reminiscence afforded to them by the Spirit in their discourses to the Church, would repeat our Lord's words with but slight variations. But if the evangelists derived our Lord's discourses not from written documents, but oral tradition, the variations which those discourses present prove that they derived them from different authorities. If they passed through any number of hands, it is utterly impossible that, after a number of years, the result of their separate inquiries would have given us three dialogues presenting such an exact verbal coincidence as the present ones.

The phenomena, therefore, present us with only two alternatives—either each of the evangelists had this discourse dictated to him by an apostle, or they have derived them from a common document. That document also could not have been an Aramaic one, but it must have existed in the Greek language, and been the work of one translator. Against the former supposition stands the fact of the different statements as to the days on which particular events occurred, which we have observed in the preceding narrative, and the variety introduced into some of our Lord's words. The following parable, also, which stands in the closest connection with this dialogue, and is reported by all three evangelists, contains most important verbal variations. Nor would this supposition account for the Greek of the evangelists being nearly the same word for word, because it would involve the fact that there must have been three distinct translators into Greek of the Aramaic, in which our Lord spoke if he used that language. The phenomena presented by this dialogue are reconcileable with one supposition only, that it must have existed in Greek in the form of a written memorandum previously to the composition of either of the Gospels, and that it was either directly used by the evangelists or had become in its verbal expression thoroughly imprinted on their memories.

But the phenomena presented by the following discourses are most remarkable and important. Matthew here introduces the short parable of the two sons directed by their father to work in the vineyard, and its application by our Lord. It is placed by him in close connection with the preceding dialogue, and evidently grew out of it, or, rather, formed a part of it. This, however, is omitted by both Mark and Luke. Matthew then represents our Lord as saying, "Hear another parable,"

and immediately gives the parable of the householder. Mark and Luke narrate the same parable. Both place it in direct connection with the preceding dialogue, and introduce it by the words, Mark, "And he began to speak unto them by parables;" Luke, "And he began to speak to the people this parable." It is particularly worthy of remark that, while Mark uses the word parables, he only gives this single parable. But the words used by Mark contain a plain intimation that our Lord uttered other parables of which he had heard, but which he has not recorded. In Matthew there are three parables, and there may have been more. These words of Mark are important, as shewing that where an evangelist passed over a portion of the evangelical history it was not always because he was ignorant of its existence. In this particular case the reason why Mark passed over these parables is obvious. All three parables tended to one common point, to shew why the Jewish rulers were induced finally to compass our Lord's death. Each of the three parables is directly levelled against them. Mark, therefore, considered that his object would be sufficiently attained by reporting one of those parables, and he has accordingly reported the one most likely to exasperate the Jewish rulers. The omission of two such similar parables, however, is a very different thing from the voluntary omission of a fact which tends to throw great light on the narrative.

We must now notice the variations on the threefold report of this parable. "There was a certain householder," says Matthew, "who"—"a certain man," say Mark and Luke—"planted a vineyard." The following expressions in Matthew and Mark present only a variation in a single word, which may easily have arisen from transcription:—"He surrounded it with a hedge, and dug a winefat in it, and built a tower, and let it to husbandmen, and departed into a far country." Luke merely notices the letting and the departure. Matthew then says, "When the time of the fruits drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen to receive its fruits." This is expressed by Mark and Luke by "And he sent to the husbandmen in due time a servant that—Mark, "he"—might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard;" Luke, "that they might give of the fruit of the vineyard." Matthew then proceeds, "And the husbandmen taking his servants, beat one, and killed another, and stoned another." But Mark and Luke agree in saying, with only a grammatical variation, "But they taking him beat him, and sent him away empty." And again, says Matthew, "he sent other servants, more than the first, and they did to them likewise." But Mark and Luke, with only a

grammatical variation, say, "He sent to them another servant, and (Mark) casting stones at him, they wounded him on the head (*ἐκεφαλάλωσαν*, properly, made short work with him) and sent him away dishonoured." Luke varies this by the expression, "But they beating and dishonouring him, sent him away empty." Matthew mentions no third mission of servants, but Mark and Luke add that he sent yet another. Mark says that they killed him, and then adds, "and many others, beating some and killing some." But Luke simply says, "Having wounded him, they cast him out." Luke then adds that the lord of the vineyard said, "What shall I do? I will send my son, my beloved one." This is represented in Mark by the expression, "Having one son, his well-beloved." This is omitted by Matthew. Matthew and Mark then say, "Last of all he sent to them his son, saying, They will reverence my son." All three evangelists then proceed with only a verbal difference. The husbandmen seeing him, said within themselves, "This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours." Matthew then says, "And taking him, they cast him out of the vineyard and killed him;"—Mark, "And taking him, they killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard;"—Luke, "And having cast him out of the vineyard, they killed him." Matthew then proceeds, "What then will he do with these husbandmen?" and represents a portion of his hearers as replying, "He will miserably destroy these wicked men, and will let out the vineyard to other husbandmen, who will give him the fruit in their seasons." But Mark and Luke incorporate these words with the parable itself, and in identically the same words, viz., "What then shall the lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard to others." Luke adds that the hearers here said, "God forbid." The following words are varied in all three. Matthew, "Jesus says to them, Have you never read in the Scriptures;" but Mark, "this Scripture;" Luke, "And earnestly looking on them, he says, What then is this which is written?" The first piece of the quotation is verbatim the same in all three evangelists. "The stone which the builders rejected, this is become for the head of the corner." Luke omits the following words, but Matthew and Mark add, verbatim, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." Here Mark concludes, but Matthew adds, "Wherefore I say unto you, that the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And he who shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder." These last words are reported by Luke verbatim.

All three then describe the result with a slight verbal variation, that they sought to seize him, but they were afraid of the people.

Such are the remarkable phenomena presented by this parable. While the variations between the versions of it, as given by the three evangelists, are considerable, it is worthy of particular remark that they do not make the smallest perceptible difference either in its sense or its application.

But these phenomena point very distinctly to the sources whence the Gospels are derived. It is self-evident that by no possible contrivance can our Lord be represented as uttering all three forms of this parable, nor can those three forms be incorporated into one. The harmonists do not attempt it.

Now, in these three forms, one thing strikes us with decisive prominence. That followed by Matthew represents a large body of servants as sent at once, and of these the husbandmen beat one, and killed another, and stoned another.- Then he describes another body as sent, more in number than the first, and that they were treated in the same manner. Mark and Luke, however, say that on the first occasion a single servant was sent, who was beaten, and dismissed empty. Afterwards the owner of the vineyard sends another servant, who, according to Mark, was stoned and wounded in the head; but, according to Luke, was beaten and sent away dishonoured. They then represent that a third servant was sent, who was killed, and cast out of the vineyard. To this Mark adds, that many others were sent, and some were beaten and some killed. This is omitted by Luke.

Now it is not necessary to determine what was the original form of the parable as it was uttered by our Lord. It is sufficient to observe that, at the time when the evangelists wrote, there must have existed two different versions of it, and that Matthew has reported the one, and Mark and Luke the other. These differences, however, cannot be attributed to design. No person with either version of the parable before him, would have wilfully altered it into the other, for the alteration would have served no purpose. In like manner it cannot be said to be the result of pure accident, for the version of the parable in Mark and Luke is evidently constructed on the one supposition, and that of Matthew on the other. The variation, however, might easily have arisen if apostolic men recited the parable in the churches, and if some of their hearers afterwards made memoranda of what they said. Supposing the account in Mark to be the full account, that in Matthew would naturally arise if a reporter concisely narrated its substance from memory.

The parable as told by Matthew and by Mark and Luke having this fundamental difference, the other variations would

be easy of solution if Mark and Luke were always at agreement in the subsequent portions of the parable when they varied from Matthew, and if they never varied from each other. We should then assume that Matthew had followed one written document, and Mark and Luke another. Even here we should be met by the difficulty, that the similarity of words and grammatical constructions imply a common source in the Greek language from which both versions of the parable were originally derived. But although the versions in Mark and Luke are fundamentally alike, they are not in perfect agreement, and occasionally Mark comes nearer to Matthew than he does to Luke. Thus Luke omits the description of the building of the hedge, the making of the winefat, and the erection of the tower, which are verbatim alike in Matthew and Mark. In the directly following clause, the words are in close agreement in Matthew and Mark, until we arrive at the variation of statement as to the mode in which the second servant was treated, Mark making him to have been stoned, and wounded in the head, and Luke beaten. Again, there is a small divergency between them as to how the third servant was treated, Mark stating that he was actually killed, and Luke, wounded and cast out. Here, again, the additional fact in Mark as to the sending of many other servants inclines toward the account in Matthew, Matthew placing it at the time of the first and second missions, and Mark after the last. The words of the account of the mission of the son closely resemble one another in all three evangelists; but it is not to be denied that, where there is a variation, the words of Mark more closely resemble those of Matthew than they do those of Luke. But in the last clause the words in which the murder of the son is described, more closely agree in Matthew and Luke than they do either in Matthew and Mark or in Mark and Luke. Again, in the reference to the prophecy, the words of Matthew and Mark more nearly resemble each other than in Luke. The citation in Matthew and Mark is the same verbatim, but Luke omits the last clause. Then, again, in the concluding words of our Lord, a sentence in Matthew and Luke agree verbatim, which, with its context, is wholly omitted by Mark.

These phenomena are certainly most singular. The brief summary of the difference is this: Mark and Luke are at agreement as to the groundwork of the parable; but in the subsequent portions occasionally Mark more resembles Matthew than he does Luke, and occasionally Luke more resembles Matthew than he does Mark. One conclusion only will be adequate to explain the facts. A common Greek account of the parable

originally existed, which had thoroughly penetrated the minds of the apostolic men who narrated it. Each evangelist used, in the composition of his Gospel, a different memorandum. In the first form assumed by these memoranda, the main distinction was that which is represented by the difference between Matthew on the one hand, and Mark and Luke on the other,—that in Matthew giving the substance of the parable in a condensed form. As these memoranda multiplied variations grew up from the original form of the parable as it is told by Mark and Luke, which are respectively represented by the variations which we read in those two evangelists. Different narrators of the parable must have incorporated into it some of the expressions which were contained in the memorandum used by Matthew. It is hardly possible that the memoranda used by the evangelists for their reports of this parable, could have contained an account of our Lord's previous dialogue out of which the parable itself grew, and of which it may be even said to be a portion, for in the one the expressions are verbatim the same, and in the other marked by the important differences we have been occupied in noticing.

We now come to the dialogue respecting the lawfulness of the payment of tribute. Amidst a variation of words, the ideas are remarkably similar. The persons proposing the question to our Lord are described by Matthew and Mark as Pharisees accompanied by Herodians, who came with the design of entrapping him. Luke calls them liars in wait, who feigned themselves just men, who came in order that they might lay hold of his words, that they might deliver him to the power and authority of the governor. This is evidently a generalized statement of the particular fact. They say, according to Matthew and Mark, in words precisely alike, "Master, we know that thou art true, and there is no care to thee for any one, for thou lookest not to the person (*πρόσωπον*) of men." Between the two clauses, however, Matthew inserts the words, "Thou teachest the way of God in truth." Luke evidently gives a summary,—"Master, we know that thou sayest and teachest rightly, and dost not accept the person." Here Mark and Luke have introduced the words of Matthew, "but Thou teachest the way of God in truth." Matthew, "Tell us, therefore, what thinkest thou." The three then proceed in words identically the same, "Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not?" Mark adds, "Shall we give, or shall we not give?" All three make the answer the same, "Shew me the tribute-money;" Mark and Luke substituting the word *denarius*, the actual money of the tribute; for the tribute-money of Matthew. Matthew and Mark agree in the following words, "Of whom is the image and

the superscription?" They say, "Cæsar's." Luke's words are, "Whose image and superscription has it?" All three give the answer, "Render the things of Cæsar to Cæsar, and the things of God to God."

The first words of the dialogue in Matthew and Mark are alike, with the exception that a sentence is inserted in Matthew which in Mark and Luke is transposed. It is very remarkable that these identical words should be found in Luke transposed as in Mark, while he varies the former words into the more vague expression, "Master, we know that you say and speak truly." Such a phenomenon could only have arisen from the existence of a common account from which the words have got varied by repetition from memory, and, when thus varied, have become the subject of a written memorandum. The existence of the common account is further shewn by the identity of the following words, only varied as they are in Mark by the expression, "Shall we give, or shall we not give?" The variation in expression in our Lord's demand for a sight of the tribute-money, is exactly such as would arise from a person quoting a document, or giving an account of it orally. A similar identity pervades both of our Lord's answers, as we read them in Matthew and Mark; the partial variation in Luke points to a similar origin. In the case of the transposition Mark and Luke are identical, and must have been derived from the same source; while in the question about the superscription, Matthew and Mark are identical, and Luke slightly varied. The phenomena, therefore, indicate the existence of a common original narrative in the Greek language, and that the evangelists used three separate memoranda founded on it, and that the variations between them have originated in their having been derived from three different oral accounts. The two coincidences between Mark and Luke, and between Matthew and Mark, which we have noticed, cannot have originated in accident.

Next comes the dialogue with the Sadducees, which presents us with similar phenomena. The words of the introduction contain such a variation as we should expect to find if they were written by three persons independent of each other. "The same day," says Matthew, "came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection (*οἱ λέγοντες*), and asked him, saying." Mark, "Then come to him the Sadducees, which say there is no resurrection" (*οἵτινες λέγουσιν*). Luke, "Then came to him certain of the Sadducees which deny (*οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες*) that there is any resurrection; and they asked him, saying, Matthew, "Master, Moses said;" Mark and Luke, "Master, Moses wrote unto us." Matthew, "If any one die, not having children;" Mark

and Luke, "If the brother of any one die;" Mark, "and leaves a wife, and does not leave children;" Luke, "having a wife, and he die childless;" Matthew, "his brother shall marry in addition his wife;" Mark and Luke, "his brother shall take his wife;" all three, "and shall raise up seed unto his brother;" but even here, while Matthew uses the word *ἀναστήσῃ*, Mark and Luke use *ἐξαναστήσῃ*. Matthew, "There were with us seven brothers;" Mark and Luke, "there were seven brothers," Matthew, "and the first having married, died, and not having seed, left his wife to his brother." Mark, "And the first took a wife, and dying, left no seed." Luke, "And the first taking a wife, died childless." Matthew, "Likewise the second;—and the third to the seventh;" Mark and Luke, "And the second took her;" Mark, "and died, nor did he leave seed: and the third likewise." Luke, "And he died childless, and the third took her;" Mark, "and the seven took her, and did not leave seed." Luke, "Likewise also the seven, and they did not leave children; and died." All three word for word, "Last of all the woman died also." In Mark there is a variation in the use of a single word of precisely the same sense. "In the resurrection then;" Mark, "when they shall rise," "whose wife is she of them?" Matthew, "Of the seven," "for all." Mark and Luke, "for the seven had her to wife." The answer. Matthew, "Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." Mark, "Do ye not err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." These words are omitted by Luke, but he introduces the sentence, "The children of this world marry and are given in marriage, but those who are deemed worthy of that age and of the resurrection from the dead." This latter sentence is represented in Matthew by the expression, "in the resurrection;" and in Mark, "for when they shall rise." All—"Neither marry nor are given in marriage." Matthew and Mark, "But are as the angels in heaven," with a slight verbal difference. But Luke says, "They are not able to die any more, but are equal to the angels, and are the sons of God, being the sons of the resurrection." These words seem like a comment on those in Matthew and Mark. Matthew, "But concerning the resurrection of the dead, have you not read that which was spoken to you by God, saying." Mark, "But concerning the dead, that they are raised, have you not read in the Book of Moses at the bush?" Luke, "But that the dead are raised even Moses indicates at the bush." Matthew and Mark, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." "God is not God of the dead, but of the living." Here, however, it must be observed, that while Matthew inserts the words "I am" (*εἰμι*), Mark omits them. Luke has, "He calls the

Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." To the concluding expression of Matthew and Mark, Luke adds the words "for all live to him;" and Mark, "you also do greatly err."

Now it is most remarkable that in the early portion of this dialogue the resemblance in words and grammatical construction is closest between Mark and Luke,—so close as to prove their common origin. This closeness of resemblance continues throughout the whole statement of the Sadducees' case against the resurrection. Throughout much of this Matthew uses different words and different constructions. A considerable difference on these points exist in the threefold report of our Lord's answer. Here it is an undeniable fact that the words used by Matthew and Mark approach one another, though not to the degree in which those of Mark and Luke do in the former portion; and those of Luke, although conveying the same sense, considerably diverge. Singular as this fact is, the careful inspection of the words and grammatical constructions in the three evangelists shew that it is undeniable. The same is true in a less degree with respect to the quotation from Moses. At the same time, while we note this remarkable difference, the whole account presents us with such a number of words and constructions in common, as to prove that it was originally derived from the same source in the Greek language.

Now what is the necessary inference from these facts? First, that the whole dialogue must have originally existed in Greek prior to the publication of either Gospel, and in that language have become deeply impressed on the minds of the apostolic teachers. Secondly, that the account of the Sadducees' objection in Mark and Luke must have originated in a common memorandum. Thirdly, that our Lord's answer in Matthew and Mark must have owed its origin to a similar common memorandum. Two different apostolic teachers must have incorporated part of the one and part of the other in their accounts, and out of this must have originated the memoranda used in the composition of the existing gospels.

We next come to our Lord's dialogue with the Pharisees. According to Matthew, the Pharisees assembled together when they had heard that the Sadducees had been silenced by our Lord, and one of them, a lawyer, asked him a question tempting him. But Mark's account proceeds on a somewhat different view of the case. "And one of the scribes having heard our Lord discussing with the Sadducees, and considering that he had answered them well, coming to him, put a question to him." Matthew, "Master, of what kind is the great commandment in

the law?" Mark, "Of what kind is the first commandment of all?" Our Lord replies (Mark), "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and;" Matthew and Mark, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God (Matth. *év*, Mark *έξ*) with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;" Mark, "and with all thy strength." Matthew, "This is the great and first commandment, and the second is like it;" Mark, "this the second;" Matthew and Mark, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" Matthew, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets;" Mark, "There is not another commandment greater than these." But Mark adds to this, in conformity with his own view of the man's character, that the scribe replied, "Well, Master, you have spoken the truth, that there is one God, and none other but he, and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love one's neighbour as oneself, is better than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices." To this remark of the scribe our Lord adds with approbation, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." There is a very faint shadow of this in Luke. He says, after our Lord's answer to the Sadducees, "And certain of the scribes answering him said, Master, thou hast said well." This is asserted of the answer to the Sadducees. Luke then says, "that they did not dare to ask him anything further;" but this is placed by Mark after the reply to the lawyer. All three evangelists then relate our Lord's question to the Pharisees as to the Sonship of the Messiah. Matthew, "What think you respecting the Christ, whose Son is he?" They reply, "David's." Mark, "how say the Scribes?" Luke, "they say that Christ is the Son of David." For "David says," Mark, "the Holy Ghost," Luke, "in the Book of Psalms, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit on my right hand until I place thy enemies;" Mark, "beneath thy feet." Luke, "the footstool of thy feet." Mark and Luke, "David (Mark "himself") calls him Lord, and whence;" Luke, "how is he his son?"

It is evident that Matthew and Mark take a different view of the lawyer's character. According to Matthew the lawyer was one of a group of Pharisees who assembled in consequence of the discomfiture of the Sadducees, and he put the question with a view of tempting our Lord. Such is obviously Matthew's view of the purpose of the question. But it is no less clear that Mark's view of it was different. According to him, a scribe had heard with approbation our Lord's answer to the Sadducees. He has no idea that the question was put in a captious spirit. Our Lord's answer to it evidently implies that it was not, and so does the scribe's admiration of our Lord's reply to his own question. Here

then it is evident, not only that Mark had fuller information than Matthew, but that if we had Matthew's account alone, we should form an incorrect view of the purpose of the questioner.

Notwithstanding this disagreement, the sense of our Lord's reply, in both evangelists, is precisely the same. The variations in the language prove that each derived it from a distinct authority. There are three differences between them in the quotation which they represent our Lord as making from Moses. So again the words vary in the introduction to the second commandment; yet neither of the variations is such as any one would ever have thought of making with a set purpose, and proves that neither evangelist borrowed from the other. No less varied in words, while similar in sense, is our Lord's comment on his own words. The variation is precisely such as two persons who made memoranda of the dialogue, would be likely to fall into. The phenomena prove that Matthew and Mark here used two different memoranda of this dialogue, of which that used by Matthew was the more imperfect; Matthew's memorandum having probably preserved one utterance of our Lord which was imperfectly preserved in Mark's,—“On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets,” this being a more perfect representation of our Lord's words than—“There is none other commandment greater than these.” The position occupied by Luke with respect to this dialogue is very singular. Knowing as we do from Matthew and Mark that it actually took place, we perceive a faint shadow of it in the words, “And certain of the scribes answering him said, Master, thou hast said well.” It is utterly inconceivable that the writer of this observation could have seen the full account given by Matthew and Mark, or any distinct narrative of the discourse at all. Still it is no less evident that he had heard something about it in an indeterminate form. He had also heard that the opponents of our Lord did not venture to ask him any more questions, but the form of what he had heard was so indistinct, that he has placed it in connection with our Lord's answer to the Sadducees.

It is evident from this that the report used by Luke of our Lord's question respecting the Sonship of the Messiah did not contain any account of our Lord's dialogue with the lawyer. If, therefore, these used by Matthew and Mark contained this, the memorandum used by Luke must have been a different one from those used by the two evangelists. But it is evident that the three accounts present us with considerable variation in expression. As this variation is palpably so purposeless that it could not have been made by design, the inference is, that each

evangelist must have followed a different memorandum. Whether that followed by Mark and Matthew contained the dialogue with the lawyer, it is impossible to say; but it is evident that that followed by Luke could not. It is also evident that there is a considerable resemblance in words and construction between that of Mark and Luke, and that they present a greater resemblance between themselves than with that of Matthew. The variations between them are such as might easily have arisen from quoting from memory, or even in the course of transcription. But between Matthew and Mark the variations are of a different character, and point to a separate origin. We must therefore conclude that they used separate memoranda.

The agreements of Mark and Luke, and their diversity from Matthew, are exhibited in the following words, where with the most inconsiderable variation the former are word for word alike. Mark, "And he said to them in his doctrine." Luke, "And all the people hearing him, he said to his disciples." Mark, "Βλέπετε;" Luke, "προέχετε, Beware of the scribes, who wish to walk in long robes, and (Luke, who love) greetings in the market places, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the chief couches in feasts, who devour the houses of widows, and for a pretence make long prayers. These shall receive greater damnation." Nothing can be more evident than that these words must have been derived from a common source in the Greek language by both evangelists. Precisely in the same connection Matthew places the longer discourse of the twenty-third chapter. It is placed by him immediately after the question respecting the Sonship of the Messiah. The auditors are stated to have been the multitude and his disciples, just as in Luke. Every phrase in the shorter discourse in Mark and Luke is to be found in the longer one of Matthew. The question arises, Are the discourses distinct, the one having been delivered as introductory to the other, or is that in Mark and Luke a very brief memorandum of the larger discourse in Matthew?

If they are distinct, they must have been spoken within a few minutes of each other, with a repetition of the same thought, in almost the same words. It has been said that Mark has shortened our Lord's discourses, and that he may have done so on this occasion. The phenomena of Mark and Luke, however, do not point to Mark's shortening our Lord's discourses, but to Mark and Luke having this discourse in the same identical words. This can only have originated from two causes;—either from their direct copying from each other, a supposition which the phenomena presented by both gospels utterly negatives,

or from their use of a common memorandum of our Lord's words. We infer, therefore, from the phenomena presented by the three evangelists, that the discourse in Matthew is the full utterance of our Lord, and that Mark's and Luke's is an extremely brief epitome of it.

While these last words uttered by our Lord, as recorded by Mark and Luke, are identical, it is remarkable that the next short sentence presents us with a slight variation. Mark, "Verily (*ἀμὴν*);" Luke, "Truly (*ἀληθῶς*) I say unto you, that this poor widow has cast in (Mark, *βέβληκε*; Luke, *έβαλεν*) more than (Luke) all (Mark) those who have cast into the treasury. For all (Luke—these) cast in from their abundance (Luke—into the offerings of God), but she of her want has cast in everything which she had,—all her living" (Mark, *δλον*; Luke, *άπαντα*). The agreement in words and grammatical construction in this saying between Mark and Luke is no less real. The trifling variations which we have exhibited may easily have arisen in the course of transcription.

We now come to our Lord's great prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, recorded by all three evangelists with considerable variations.

Matthew, "And Jesus going out departed from the temple, and his disciples came to him to point out to him the buildings of the temple." This is represented in Mark by, "And as he was going out from the temple, *one* of his disciples says to him, Master, lo, the great stones and the great buildings." Luke, "And some speaking of the temple, how it was adorned with beautiful stones and offerings, he said:" Matthew, "do you not see all these things;" Mark, "do you see these great buildings;" Matthew and Mark, "There shall not be left stone on stone, which shall not be thrown down." (There is a slight grammatical difference in Mark in the last words.) But Luke represents the utterance thus, "With respect to all these things which ye behold, the days shall come in which," etc. Matthew and Mark, "While he was sitting on the mount of Olives," (Mark, "opposite the temple,") "his disciples" (Mark, "Peter and James, and John and Andrew,") "asked him" (Mark, "came to him,") "privately." This is simply given by Luke, without noticing any change of place. "But they (*i.e.*, the disciples generally) asked him." Matthew, Mark, Luke, "Tell us when shall these things be, and what the sign." Matthew, "of thy coming and the end of the dispensation." Mark and Luke, "when these things shall begin to be accomplished" (Mark, *συντελείσθαι*; Luke, *γίνεσθαι*). Our Lord replies, Matthew and Mark, "See that no one deceive you;" Luke, "that ye be

not deceived;" all, "for many shall come in my name, saying, I am (Matthew) the Christ." Mark and Luke, "I am he," (Luke) "and the time is at hand." Matthew and Mark, "and shall deceive many." Luke, "do not go after them." Matthew, "you are about to." Mark and Luke, "When you shall" "hear of wars and rumours of wars" (Luke, "and commotions"). Matthew, "beware, be not troubled" (Luke uses *μὴ πτοηθῆτε*; Matthew and Mark, *μὴ θροεῖσθε*). All, "for it is necessary (Matthew, that all things) should happen, but the end is not yet" (Luke, *εὐθέως*). "For nation shall against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be famines and pestilences, and earthquakes in places." In place of famines Mark has *ταραχαί*, and Luke adds, "fearful sights and great signs from heaven." Matthew and Mark, "These are the beginning of sorrows." Mark adds, "See to yourselves." Luke, "before all these things, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you." Matthew, "and they shall deliver you into tribulation, and shall kill you, and ye shall be hated of all nations on account of my name." But Mark is more full, "They shall deliver you to councils, and ye shall be beaten in synagogues, and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a witness to them; and it is necessary that the Gospel should first be preached to all nations. But when they lead you away, and deliver you up, do not be anxious beforehand what ye shall speak, nor feel care about it, for whatever shall be given you in that hour, that speak, for it is not you that speaks, but the Holy Ghost." Luke's is evidently a concise account of Mark, "And they shall persecute you, delivering you to kings and governors for my sake, but it shall result to you for a testimony. Fix it therefore in your heart, not to be previously anxious about making your defence." He adds, "for I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist." Here Matthew says in general words, "Many shall be scandalized, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another." But Mark definitely, "Brother shall betray brother to death, and father child, and parents shall rise up against their offspring, and cause them to be put to death." Of these words those of Luke are a summary, "And ye shall be betrayed by parents, and brothers, and kinsmen, and friends, and they shall put some of you to death." Mark and Luke, "And ye shall be hated of all nations on account of my name;" which is introduced here in exactly the same words as in the place where they are transposed in Matthew. Here Luke adds, "But a hair of your heads shall not perish. In your patience possess ye your souls." Matthew then introduces a

clause wanting in the other two, "And many false Christs shall arise, and shall deceive many, and through the abounding of iniquity, the love of many shall wax cold." Matthew and Mark, "But he that endures to the end, this man shall be saved." The insertion of these words by Mark in his narrative almost implies the existence of the former sentence in Matthew. Here follows in Matthew a sentence which we have already seen in Mark in a different connection, "And this gospel of the kingdom must first be preached," etc. To which Matthew adds, "and then shall the end come." Matthew and Mark then continue in nearly the same words, "But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place (Mark, where it ought not), let him who reads understand; then let those in Judæa flee to the mountains, let him who is on the housetop not come down (Mark, nor enter his house), to take anything from his house, and let him who is in the field not come back to fetch his clothes." Of these words, Luke gives us what is evidently intended for a summary, and almost an interpretation, "And when ye shall see Jerusalem encompassed by armies, know that its desolation is near. Then let those who are in Judæa flee to the mountains, and let those who are in the midst of it go out, and let those who are in the country not enter it, for these are the days of vengeance, so that all things which are written should be fulfilled." In these words of Luke we almost seem to hear the utterance of some apostolical man, partly giving the words of our Lord, but more largely accommodating them as to interpret their meaning, in order that they might be a distinct warning to his hearers, and that they might act on them as soon as the event occurred. Then follows in all three the sentence, "But woe to them that are with child, and to those who give suck in those days." Matthew and Mark then continue, "But pray that your flight be not in the winter (Matthew adds, nor on the sabbath), for there shall be great tribulation, such as has not been from the beginning of creation, (Mark) which God created, until now, nor shall be, for except those days should be shortened." Mark, "except the Lord shortened the days, no flesh should be saved, but, on account of the elect (Mark, whom he has chosen) these days shall be shortened" (Mark, he has shortened the days). This is represented in Luke by the condensed expression, "There shall be a great strait over this land, and wrath on this people, and they shall fall by the edge of the sword." Here Luke adds, "And they shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

Matthew and Mark then proceed nearly word for word, "Then if any one shall say unto you, Lo, here is the Messiah, or there, believe it not, for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall give (Matthew, great) signs and wonders, so as to deceive (Matthew, *ὥστε πλανῆσαι*; Mark, *πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανῆν*), if it were possible, even the elect. Behold, I have forewarned you." Mark adds, "See to it." Here Matthew introduces a distinct clause, "If any one shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert, go not forth. Behold, he is in the secret chambers, believe it not, for as the lightning proceeds from the east, and appears as far as the west, thus shall the coming of the Son of Man be. For, wherever the carcase is, thither shall the eagles be gathered together."

Here all three evangelists resume. Matthew, "And immediately after the tribulation of those days." Mark, "And in those days after that tribulation," "the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall (Mark, shall be falling), and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken." Luke's is evidently an epitome, "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken." But here he introduces the mention of certain earthly signs. The first of these is, "on earth, distress of nations with perplexity," which although in words entirely different, is the same in sense, and is a very brief epitome of what has been previously given by Matthew and Mark. Of the same nature are the next words, "Men's hearts failing them for fear, and expectation of the things coming on the earth." Both these sentences look almost like a commentary on the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first verses of Matthew, and seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth of Mark. The only matter which is positively additional is the intermediate words, "The sea and the waves roaring." Matthew then adds, "and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven." All three resume, "And they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds (Luke, a cloud) with great power and glory." Matthew and Mark add, "And he shall send forth his angels (Matthew, with a great sound of the trumpet), and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the extremes of the heavens to the extremes of them." But Mark, "from the extreme of earth to the extreme of heaven." Here Luke adds, "When these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." This addition again has much the appearance of a commentary. Matthew and Mark then proceed verbatim the same. "From the fig-tree learn the parable; When its branch is tender and

puts forth leaves, you know that summer is near. So also ye, when ye shall see these things, know that it is near at the doors. Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away until all these things take place. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and the hour no man knows, not even the angels of heaven." Mark adds, "nor the Son, but the Father." In place of the words "nor the Son," Matthew places, "but my Father only." Of both the description and the parable Luke gives a summary. "Behold the fig-tree and all the trees. When they spring forth, seeing it, ye know from yourselves that the summer is near. Thus when ye see these things happening, know that the kingdom of God is near." Then follows the declaration that the end should take place during the existence of the then *yeved*, in the same words as Matthew and Mark.

Each evangelist proceeds to represent our Lord as giving warnings as to the unexpectedness of His coming, and the duty of watching, but in each the warnings themselves and the language used greatly differ. In Matthew our Lord compares his coming to the days of Noah and the flood, and announces that at his coming men will be engaged in their ordinary employments. From this he deduces the duty of watchfulness, and enforces that duty from the care with which the owner of a house watches against the thief, and further enforces this duty from the example of the dealings of a master with a faithful and unfaithful overseer of his affairs. In Mark our Lord enforces the duty, but in very different language from the last consideration. Luke is still more general, and represents our Lord simply as enforcing the general duty of vigilance, because his coming would be as a snare to the inhabitants of the earth.

The comparison of the different accounts of this discourse, as it is reported by the three evangelists, renders it evident that they are of a very fragmentary nature. The mere inspection of them shews that Matthew and Mark present the closest points of agreement, and that between them and Luke the divergencies are considerable. But while Matthew and Mark verbally agree in many important points, there is yet a considerable amount of matter in the one which is not in the other.

Thus, in the introduction to the prophecy, Matthew and Mark are in possession of larger information than Luke, and Mark than Matthew. Matthew tells us that the reference to the destruction of the temple was made by the disciples generally, by one of them. Matthew and Mark here inform us that the prophecy itself was not delivered until after their departure from the Mount of Olives. Matthew vaguely says the

disciples, but Mark expressly says that there were four in particular who came to him to put him the question which led to the utterance of the prophecy. The whole of this is stated by Luke quite indefinitely, without any distinction of time or place. Mark and Luke, however, agree that the words of the disciples were, "What shall be the sign when these things shall begin to be accomplished?" but Matthew says, "Of thy coming and of the end of the dispensation." The words of Matthew extend the question to the signs of the coming of the Messiah, while that of Mark and Luke represent it only as having reference to the words of our Lord, that there should not be left one stone on another which should not be thrown down.

Still, however, on examining the prophecy, we cannot find any distinct difference in the mode of its representation such as to justify us in coming to the conclusion, that while Matthew intended to report it as not only bearing on the destruction of Jerusalem, but also on the appearance of the Messiah, Mark and Luke intended to report only such portions of it as bore on the former event. We must therefore conclude, that as far as the question is concerned, the one is merely a different version of the other, or that the question in Matthew is that to which it subsequently expanded itself in their own minds.

Now, from a comparison of the prophecy itself, as it is represented in the three evangelists, it is impossible to say that either one of them contains the exact utterance of our Lord. Each inserts things not mentioned by either of the other two. Matthew and Mark more closely agree together than either does with Luke, but yet these present us with considerable diversities. According to Luke, a break occurred in the utterance of our Lord at the tenth verse, where he introduces the words, "and he said to them." We must also observe that there were only four apostles who heard this discourse; and, consequently, if each gave a report of it, there would be only four different forms in which the discourse could have originally appeared. The comparatively early death of James may have reduced these to three. Now, in the portion of the discourse before the break, Matthew and Mark have ten lines identical in grammar, and all but identical in words. Luke inserts the words, "The time is at hand." Matthew and Mark insert the words, "And shall deceive many;" and Luke the words, "Go not therefore after them;" and occasionally varies the Greek expressions used by Matthew and Mark. For all practical purposes Matthew and Mark may be viewed as positively identical. In this part of the prophecy, therefore, the phenomena imply that Matthew and Mark used the same source of information, and Luke a slightly different one.

The next passage consists of eight lines in Matthew, seven in Mark, and seven in Luke. Of these five in Matthew and Mark again are nearly identical ; in place of pestilences, Mark having substituted the word confusions (*ταραχαι*). Luke adds, "there shall be terrible sights and great signs from heaven." Otherwise up to this point the variation between the three evangelists is trifling, and may easily have arisen from copying from dictation.

In the next paragraph Mark is decisively fuller than Matthew. Luke follows Mark, but in an abridged form. Matthew consists of eight lines, Mark twenty-six, Luke twenty-four, the number in Luke being increased by the insertion of seven lines which are found in neither of the other two. Of these there are only two lines, "Ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake," which are exactly alike in all three evangelists. The account in Mark has every appearance of being the nearest approach to the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord. The definiteness of its expressions are striking. The corresponding passages in the other two evangelists are evidently summaries of it. Luke, however, has inserted two remarkable additions. To this follow eleven lines in Matthew, which are entirely absent in Luke, and only two lines of which exist in Mark, where they are found word for word, being a kind of aphorism, "He that endureth to the end shall be saved;" four lines of the addition in Matthew are transposed into another place in Mark. Matthew has, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations." Mark had previously said, in a different connection, that "it was necessary that the gospel should first be preached to all nations."

The three evangelists again resume at their fifteenth, fourteenth, and twentieth verses. The passage consists of forty-one lines in Matthew, forty-five in Mark, and twenty-two in Luke. Of these, forty in Matthew and Mark are very nearly in absolute verbal agreement, the variations being such as might easily have arisen from transcription or dictation. With these there are only five lines in Luke presenting absolute verbal agreement. The variation in him as to the sign, on the appearance of which the disciples were to leave Jerusalem, has the appearance of an explanation, and the remainder of an abridgement of the full account in Matthew and Mark. But here again Luke has inserted a sentence at the end of this description which in definiteness greatly exceeds anything in Matthew and Mark, and which contains a statement as to the termination of the desolation of the Jewish people. In a similar manner as in the preceding paragraph, Matthew here introduces a sentence as to the suddenness of the coming of the Son of Man, which is entirely wanting

in the other two evangelists. On the evangelists resuming, the next paragraph consists in Matthew of forty-six lines, Mark forty-five, Luke thirty-nine. Of these, thirty-nine in Matthew and Mark are identical with the most inconsiderable verbal variation; but sixteen only in Luke; and eight more lines in Luke have all the appearance of being a summary of longer passages in Matthew and Mark. One passage in Luke seems to be a representation of a passage in Matthew omitted by Mark. Matthew, "Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn." Luke, "And upon earth distress of nations with perplexity. Men's hearts failing them for fear, and from expectation of the things coming on the earth." Four lines are inserted by him in the way of encouragement, which are found neither in Matthew nor Mark.

Each evangelist has concluded the discourse with warnings to vigilance. In Matthew the warnings are more particular and exact, and are followed by a long discourse on the same subject. Of this, the two warnings in Mark and Luke may be considered as epitomes.

One thing the careful study of the three versions of this prophecy makes evident, that it is impossible to consider that the variations which we find in them are the result of direct and deliberate design. This disposes for ever with the supposition that either evangelist had deliberately read the account of this discourse as given by another, and then proceeded to alter it into the form in which we read it in his pages. Such alterations, the small variations,—and above all the transpositions, could have answered no end. In all three evangelists we read what is substantially the same prophecy, with such variations as prove that the accounts are distinct, but with such samenesses as to prove a common source of information. Now let us suppose that this prophecy was early set forth in Greek, and that the three apostles who heard it had read this Greek account of it, and that the form of the expression and constructions had become deeply impressed on their minds. They would consequently repeat it to the churches in nearly the same words, the influence of the Spirit, according to the promise, refreshing their memories as to the main ideas. One apostle might also add a sentence from his personal recollection. Such additions we have seen in each of the three accounts, which, while they leave the prophecy substantially the same, have enriched it in its minor details. Supposing two of these accounts to have been copied down in the written memoranda, we should naturally meet with the phenomena which we find in Matthew and Mark; for if the Gospel was actually written by Matthew, still of this

discourse he was not a hearer. The discourse in Luke bears the indications of a similar origin, only that the person who first reduced it to writing abridged the parts which form a portion of the common narrative, or it may have been so abridged by the original apostolic teacher, who at the same time may have added a few additional utterances of our Lord which were not in the common account.

It is particularly worthy of remark, that with all the variations, or whatever amount of oral transmission we may suppose the prophecy to have passed through, the three reports are substantially the same. They introduce no really new feature into the prophecy. Now nothing is so difficult to transmit with correctness by word of mouth, as a prophecy. The difficulty of transmitting this particular prophecy would be greatly increased, owing to the nature of its subject-matter, bearing as it does on a subject most exciting to the mind of man. The difficulty of such transmission would have been doubtless decreased, if the prophecy had been written in verse, as many other professed prophecies have been composed. But it is not. Now touching as this prophecy does on a subject so exciting to the popular feelings and imagination, had it been merely composed, and trusted to mere oral delivery for its transmission to posterity; or had there not been some supernatural assistance afforded to the apostles to fix in their minds the things actually uttered by our Lord, long before the time in which it was incorporated into either of our existing gospels, a great divergency not of words but of statements, would have got into it. One imagination would have incorporated into it one terrible portent, and one another. A few years of such transmission would have hardly enabled the account of the prophecy, as it existed in one church to be identified with that which existed in another. Men's minds, filled as they were with the expectation of the speedy coming of Christ, would have largely incorporated into it such events of the passing day as were esteemed to be indications of his coming, as veritable utterances of our Lord. Persons whose minds are deeply occupied with these subjects greedily manufacture every event of their time into an indication of the near approach of the end. The fervency of their imaginations would have speedily prevented such persons from distinctly remembering what things they had been told were the utterances of our Lord, and which were the creations of their own minds. Before long the whole discourse would have been split up into a number of grotesque and mythic details, so that it would be scarcely recognizable. But the prophecy as we read it in the evangelists, is not only substantially the same prophecy, but it

contains numbers of the same words and grammatical constructions. Those who assert that its origin is mythic are bound to account for this. The phenomena point to one fact, and to one fact only,—that the discourse must have been preserved, if reported by several apostles from memory, by the aid of supernatural assistance, and while its variations prove that it is derived from several sources of information, its absolute unity shews that these accounts could not have passed through any great amount of oral delivery before they were committed to writing, and that the authors of our present gospels derived them from such written accounts.

The following, therefore, are some of the leading points to which the phenomena presented by this series of parallel discourses of our Lord point with a greater or less degree of certainty.

1. If our Lord did not speak in Greek, we may infer with absolute certainty, that an account of the whole, or far more probably, of detached portions of his discourses, was set forth at a very early period in the Greek language, and that the separate documents containing them were not translated into the Greek language by many translators,—but by one. This original account form the basis of the identities of words and grammatical constructions which we find in our present gospels.

2. That these accounts had become deeply engraven on the minds of apostolic men in their actual words, and when they gave accounts to the churches of our Lord's life and discourses, they instinctively used the words and grammatical constructions of the original documents.

3. That the converts in the early churches composed memoranda of the narratives delivered by apostolic men, of greater or less completeness. Sometimes these memoranda gave a close approximation to the words themselves; at other times they gave a summary of the sense. Apostolic men also frequently gave such additional utterances of our Lord as they remembered, but which formed no portion of the original account, and in their oral reports not unfrequently introduced variations into the language. These were not unfrequently made the subject of memoranda and incorporated into them. From these and similar sources the diversities in our gospels have originated.

4. The discourses in the synoptic Gospels have been derived from these and similar sources of information.

5. If one problem in literature seems to be capable of being established on evidence which is absolutely conclusive, the comparison of the parallel discourses in the synoptics renders it certain that neither of their authors could have read the account of the other. To suppose that this was the case, and that the

author of a Gospel, after he had read one of the others, deliberately altered the discourses into the form in which they appear in his own, is to suppose that the evangelists were not only destitute of inspiration, but of common sense. Nothing seems to be established on more conclusive evidence, than that the three Gospels, with all their wonderful identities and diversities of expression, have been composed entirely independently of each other.

6. The phenomena likewise prove that neither writer possessed an exclusive source of information. It is impossible to assume that either Matthew, Mark, or Luke, contain the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord, and that the other two contain the substance only of his utterances. Matthew's account of the discourses is often the fullest, and appears to approach nearest to the *ipsissima verba*. But this is far from being always the case. Not unfrequently Mark gives what has the appearance of being a nearer approach to the exact words of our Lord than Matthew, while the latter gives the sense only. Although the parallel discourses in Luke not unfrequently present us with greater divergencies, there are not wanting occasions when they possess a greater degree of exactness than those of the other two evangelists, not to say that a whole series of discourses is reported by him, which are entirely omitted by Matthew and Mark. At one time Mark more nearly approaches the words and grammatical constructions used by Matthew, at another time those used by Luke. The same is true with respect to Luke. The phenomena therefore point to the fact that the three Gospels have been composed by the aid of a considerable number of documents, which originally grew out of a common source of information in the Greek language, which is the origin of the identities in words and grammatical constructions. Many of these documents were memoranda, derived from the accounts of different apostolical men, who furnished valuable additions from their own individual recollection. From these again additional memoranda were composed. The author of each Gospel freely used in its composition the various sources of information with which he was acquainted, following in the main the particular form of the account which he had been in the habit of hearing from the apostle with whom he had been chiefly associated.

7. It is evident that the evangelists present us sometimes with the sense only, and not unfrequently with merely a summary of the utterances of our Lord.

8. It is impossible to assert that because one utterance, or a portion of it, is omitted by one or even two of the evangelists, that therefore that utterance is an unimportant one.

9. The authority upon which our Lord's utterances rest is the testimony of apostolic men, whose memory was assisted to report them in such a manner as to insure that they should be correct representations of our Lord's meaning, by the supernatural assistance of the Spirit, in accordance with our Lord's promise.

10. Although these discourses were originally committed to writing by various persons, yet, while one recorded one discourse and one another, while different narrators introduced different additional utterances, and while in the course of transmission these utterances of our Lord have undergone considerable variation in the language in which they have been expressed, still these discourses, as recorded by all three evangelists, present a complete and perfect unity. In the whole course of their transmission no portion of the human personality of the reporter has been transfused into them. In neither of the evangelists do we find the discourses made the vehicle of teaching different doctrines from those taught by the other. However great the variations, they merely unfold, without adding to the sense. In the pages of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, whatever was the diversity of the materials used by them, we see before us the same Jesus.

11. This preservation by the three evangelists of the identity of our Lord, free from all intermixture derived from the minds through whom his utterances were transmitted, notwithstanding the number of years which had elapsed between the utterance of the discourses and the composition of the Gospels, and the variety of the materials out of which the Gospels were composed, and the amount of human agency, as well as the number of minds which must have been employed in their transmission is without any parallel in the history of man, and forms a most unquestionable proof that a supernatural influence was exerted over the minds of those who were concerned in the composition of our Gospels, by means of which every foreign element of thought or feeling has been effectually excluded from intermixing itself with the teaching of our Lord. Every phenomenon indicates that the discourses in the Gospels contain the substance of the utterances of Jesus Christ, free from all intermixture derived from the minds of his followers. That this should have been effected, notwithstanding the mode in which our Lord's utterances have been handed down, is as strong an evidence of a supernatural influence exerted over the minds of their authors as any miracle which is recorded in their pages.

(To be continued.)

SCRIPTURE REVELATIONS ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE DEAD.

WHETHER or not we have carried our readers with us in the conclusions at which we arrived in our former paper on "The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment and Immortality," we would ask their careful consideration of the thoughts which we would now place before them, on a subject intimately connected, indeed, with the former one, but which we shall discuss quite independently of the conclusions which we have arrived at in our former paper.

The question we mean now to discuss is, what light, if any, does Scripture cast upon the state of the dead, previous to the resurrection-day. We mean to confine ourselves strictly to these limits; we shall, therefore, not speak of the nature of the resurrection bodies of the righteous, or of the wicked, or of the various localities assigned respectively to each, nor touch upon the numerous points of interest connected therewith. The position of the dead in the intermediate state is a subject that opens up of itself so many points of interest, that we can, indeed, only lightly touch upon some of them.

We purpose, too, in our present review of the subject to confine ourselves to Scripture. It may be possible for certain portions of the subject to receive illustration from science or philosophy, but without altogether disdaining such helps in those departments which lie partly within their ken, we shall limit ourselves to the examination of "what saith the Scripture?"

The first point that strikes us in this investigation is, what does Scripture tell us regarding the soul itself in this middle state? is it in a state of consciousness or not? Do our souls sleep till the great trumpet of the archangel shall summon us in the resurrection morn? or are we even in this intermediate state in a condition of conscious activity?

The death of the saints is indeed called a "sleeping in Jesus" (1 Cor. xv. 18; 1 Thess. iv. 14). In anticipation thereof, Paul could exclaim, "to me to die is gain" (Phil. i. 21), and the patriarch express his assurance that "there the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest" (Job iii. 17). The righteous are said to "enter into peace" (Isaiah lvii. 2); "to be present with the Lord" (2 Cor. v. 8); they are "with Christ," which is far better than life on this earth (Phil. i. 23). Our Lord speaks of the death of Lazarus under the expression, "our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep" (John xi. 11), and in Old Testament phraseology the death of individuals was often spoken of under the statement, "he slept with his fathers."

Some of these expressions give countenance to the idea that the state after death is one of sleep, while others of them which speak of that state being gain, and of the righteous in it enjoying the presence of Christ, seem rather to support the view that it is a state of joyous consciousness.

One text we have purposely excluded from the above list, as it is not clear whether it refers to the intermediate or the resurrection state, namely, Rev. xiv. 11, where the words "from henceforth" may refer to the time after the destruction of Babylon the great and the final judgment, and it would take us too long to discuss the question.

There are yet two other passages which allude to this state, in relation to the condition of the righteous dead, and one that has a still more extended reference. We allude to the comforting assurance that our Lord gave the penitent thief, "this day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke xxiii. 43); and the parable concerning Dives and Lazarus in Luke xvi. 19—31, which implies unmistakably that both the good and the evil in the middle state are conscious of their respective conditions.

Stephen, just before he yielded up the ghost, had a glorious view of the risen Redeemer, into whose hands he committed his spirit (Acts vii. 55—60), and it is hard to believe that the sleep into which he fell immediately after was more than the sleep of his mortal frame, and that he was not immediately escorted to the presence of that Saviour who so graciously strengthened his proto-martyr in his dying hour.

On the Mount of Transfiguration Moses, as well as Elias, appeared in glory, and if the case of the latter cannot be fairly cited as an example of one in the interim state, no fair reason can be assigned against the case of the former being so brought forward.

The expression, "the spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb. xii. 23), which refers to all the departed righteous, from Abel downwards, who are mentioned by the apostle as forming an essential part of the Church Catholic, loses all force and beauty of meaning, if we are to suppose those spirits to be in an unconscious condition.

Rev. vi. 9, 10 might also be cited in defence of the position we advocate of a conscious state of the righteous dead, but as it is open to many objections, we will not press it into our service. Several passages also from the Old Testament we forbear to use, as they would require considerable space in discussion.

The above passages, however, we think are sufficient to prove that the righteous in the intermediate state are in a state of blessed consciousness. That the wicked are alike conscious, and

suffer punishment, at least in anticipation, Heb. x. 26 gives us great reason to conjecture, a conjecture which is confirmed by the passages in 2 Pet. ii. 4 and Jude 6, if those passages apply to any of the unrighteous dead (as by and by we shall attempt to prove); and finally, the parable of Dives and Lazarus puts this view beyond legitimate doubt.

But that parable is capable of a much wider application, and goes far to settle the second question, namely, whether departed souls are in a fixed state or not, that is, whether the state in which they die is one which will continue without alteration, the righteous remaining righteous, and the unrighteous similarly remaining unrighteous, or whether there is a possibility of that pardon, which was not sought after and obtained on earth, being granted to those who repent on the other side of the grave.

We say, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus throws some light on this very subject. For we learn from it, that immediately after, or shortly after death, the rich man was placed in a state of misery, the beggar brought to a state of happiness. The anxiety of the rich man after his brothers on earth shews us that the scene embraces the very state we are discussing, and not the state of godly and ungodly after the judgment-day.

Both alike seem to be fully conscious, the one of his bliss, the other of his misery; and both, that their respective portions were the result of their several actions when on earth.

Two other important points are pressed upon us by the teaching of our Saviour in this parable. First, that the blessed, even if willing, are not able to alleviate the sufferings of the wicked; and secondly, that a great gulf was fixed between both to prevent any passage from either side to the other.

Now many questions may be raised about this parable and its interpretation which do not affect these conclusions. For instance, whether the whole was a real occurrence, or was merely a parable conveying deep meaning indeed, but still not to be viewed as literally true. It may be questioned, and there is very little to guide us to a conclusion on either side, whether the punishment of the wicked in this middle state, or even at the last, will consist in being punished with material fire, or not. It may be gravely questioned whether the lost and saved can hold intercourse with one another, although so described as a necessity of the parable. The introduction of Abraham,* too, into the scene, is one which gave life to the picture, in the eyes of the Jews, but must not be strained literally.

* The Jews were wont, as Lightfoot has learnedly shewn, to call the state into which righteous men are admitted after death by three different names:—first, *Paradise*; secondly, *Abraham's bosom*; and thirdly, *lying under God's*

But whatever decision we may arrive on these several points, or any others that may be raised, we do not see how we can avoid drawing the conclusion that our Lord teaches that the souls of the righteous departed this life are in rest and felicity, that the souls of the unrighteous are in a state of misery, and that both these states are final and unchangeable.

Independently of this positive Scripture proof, we might argue to the same effect from the analogy of Holy Writ. What meaning can be fairly assigned to those many passages which speak of punishments and rewards, meted out hereafter for the deeds done in the body? of all words and actions and thoughts being brought up for judgment, and punished or rewarded according to their several deserts, if we are to imagine that a time of grace and opportunity of repentance is to be given after death to those who despised the free offers of pardon through Christ's atoning blood, when in life? The case of the heathen stands on a different footing, and we are disposed to think that Scripture does not hold out any hopes of their *general* salvation, whatever may be the case exceptionally. This conclusion seems forced on us from a review of the various passages which speak of the awful state of man without Christ, of the blindness of his understanding and the hardness of his heart, and of the hopelessness of all attempts to get life outside that life displayed in Christ. In our former paper we have plainly expressed our ideas on this head. Their everlasting punishment, if by that term be meant a never-ending torture of their souls and bodies in hell, would be hard to reconcile with God's character of love. Their everlasting punishment, if by that term be simply meant an everlasting exclusion from heaven, and such other punishment as they may deserve, resulting in an utter loss of consciousness or an extinction of their being, is quite defensible, if the deserts of sin, its awful nature, and the justice of God, be taken into account.

The passage in Rom. ii. 12 might, too, be cited in proof of the view we have advanced. It may, too, be argued that were it otherwise the apostles would not have laboured so energetically, nor would so many incitements be given in the New Testament to urge the Church forward to the work of missions. If, as Mr. Ker advocates in his work on *Immortality and Eternal Punishment*, the chance of repentance after death be afforded to all who have not heard of the Gospel in this life, then who would not

throne. Their views drawn from the Old Testament writings by laboured deduction were on these subjects correct in the main, and hence our Lord himself uses the two first named expressions. On the last compare Rev. vi. 9, 10, bearing in mind that the Jews regarded the altar as the throne of God.

prefer to leave the heathen as they are, knowing well that the chances of their acceptance of the Gospel after death must be much greater than experience proves it to be in life.

There is, indeed, an ingenious argument raised in defence of this idea of salvation after death, which is founded on the famous passages in 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20 and 1 Pet. iv. 6.

Before we proceed, however, to discuss these passages, we must, in order to complete the general view of the subject we are endeavouring to give, say a few words on the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, which we have hitherto left out of sight.

Purgatory is, by the divines of the Romish Church and her recognized authorities, considered to be a place where the faithful atone for such venial sins, as they may not have repented for in life, by various punishments of various lengths and severities. Nothing unclean can enter heaven; therefore, say they, those who die before they have repented of all their lesser sins must be purified from these in the purgatorial fire. The blood of Christ has remitted the eternal punishment, but some punishment must still be inflicted notwithstanding.

This doctrine, however, is in plain opposition to the statements, that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us *from all sin*" (1 John i. 7, 9); that "there is *no condemnation* to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1); "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool" (Isaiah i. 18); "By one offering Christ hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14); "With his stripes we are healed" (Isaiah liii. 5, 11). Hosts of passages could be adduced to prove the fulness and freeness of Christ's pardon, all which are rendered well nigh meaningless by this dogma of the Church of Rome. See Rom. viii. 33; Isaiah xlv. 22; xliii. 25; Jer. l. 20; Micah vii. 19; Eph. v. 25, 27; Col. i. 14; ii. 14; Titus iii. 5; Rev. i. 5; vii. 14.

The doctrine, too, attaches a value to the fire of purgatory, in sanctifying and cleansing the soul, which Scripture assigns to the Holy Spirit.

The Biblical arguments in its favour are few and far fetched. Much stress is laid by its advocates upon the word *till* in Matt. v. 25, 26, and the corresponding passage in Luke xii., in order to enable such a meaning to be extracted; but see Psalm cx. 1; Isaiah xxii. 14; Gen. viii. 6, 7; Isaiah xlv. 4, and as a strong *ad hominem* argument, Matt. i. 25. 1 Cor. iii. 10—15 is eagerly caught at as a proof passage, because in it the word "*fire*" occurs. But the apostle is there speaking of Christian ministers,

whose works will all be tried by the fire of judgment in the day of the Lord, and if found then to endure, they shall receive especial rewards as faithful ministers ; but if the teacher's work be not genuine, even though he may himself be a believer, he shall lose the reward of a teacher, though for his individual faith he may not be excluded from the *free gift* of salvation through Christ Jesus. The passages in 1 Peter, already alluded to, are also adduced in favour of this dogma, but we reserve them for a special discussion.

Our Lord's statement that the sin against the Holy Ghost "shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come" (Matt. xii. 32), is also quoted by the Romanists to prove that there is forgiveness of sins in the next world, and consequently that there is a purgatory. No doubt there is a clear *non sequitur* here, for the one does not necessarily infer the other. Hence, though denying the Romanists' conclusion, a similar view of the passage is taken by Mr. Barlow in his work, which we have noticed in our former article.¹ Mr. Barlow, indeed, does not attempt to discuss the passage, but superciliously remarks : "It is curious to observe the agonies of the defenders of irreversible damnation at death in the presence of these words, which surely *seem* to indicate that, although the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is irremissible, *some* sins might be forgiven in the world to come."

But notwithstanding the confidence of the Romanists and the superciliousness of Mr. Barlow, the text in question cannot be shewn to teach what they desire to prove. The parallel passages in Mark iii. 29 and Luke xii. 10 shew that the *meaning* of our Lord was simply to intimate that the sin in question should not be forgiven. The peculiar phrase used in Matthew does not occur in the other Evangelists.

The explanation of that phrase is also very simple, and it does not become a scholar like Mr. Barlow to ignore it as he does. The Jews made use of the expression, עולם הבא, "the world to come," in two different senses ; first, to signify the state after death ; and, secondly, as a common name for *the times of the Messiah*. The exact words used in Matthew *l. c.* are found in Heb. vi. 5, in this very signification, and a cognate expression (rendered not badly in our Authorized Version by the same phrase) occurs in the identical same sense in Heb. ii. 5. The meaning of our Lord's warning seems to have been, that neither

¹ *Eternal Punishment and Eternal Death. An Essay.* By James William Barlow, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity Coll., Dublin. London : Longmans. 1865.

under the old covenant, which was then passing away, nor under the new, which was to be manifested when his sacrifice was offered up, was any provision made for the pardon of such a sin.

In passing from this subject, and before treating of the difficult passages in 1 Peter, we must say a few words on the practice of prayers for the dead. These prayers are very natural, if the Romish doctrine of purgatory be embraced as true; but if that be rejected as repugnant to God's Word, we think they ought to fall with it also. Yet it cannot be denied that very early in the history of the Church such prayers were wont to be offered up, and the Greek Church, while denying the existence of a purgatory, has still retained this practice.

The motives which influenced the early Christians in offering up such prayers were various. Some thought that though the safety and rest of the righteous were secure, still that their happiness in the intermediate state was capable of increase, and therefore they prayed for them. Others prayed that their friends might obtain part in the first resurrection (Rev. xx. 5, 6); and others, too, under the false impression that at the end of the world even the righteous should have to pass through the fire, which should consume the world in general, to their peculiar abodes in heaven, and that that fire would be the means of effecting their complete purification, prayed that the Lord might deal graciously with them in that day. We say under a false impression, for Scripture informs us that both the saints which may be alive at that day, and those which shall be raised, shall escape that final mundane conflagration.

But whatever their motives may have been, and however it is true that prayers for the dead do not necessarily involve a belief in a purgatory, we hold the maintainers of such practices were seriously in error. The history of the Church is a history of the development of error, as well as of the manifestation of the truth, and we are not to forget that the seeds of the great apostasy, which afterwards took place, were growing up even in apostolic times. Scripture, which we take as our only rule, gives us to understand that those who die unholy remain for ever in that condition; that those who die filthy are not cleansed after death; and that the righteous and the holy are, on the other hand, preserved in their righteous and holy state. We have no right to rush in where Scripture gives us no clue; nor to dare, with human philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men and not after Christ;—to intrude into those things we have not seen, vainly puffed up by our fleshly minds (Col. ii. 8, 18). No instance can be shewn in Holy Writ of prayers being offered up for the departed by the saints on earth, or of any such custom

being recommended to us to follow. We refuse to leave the sure ground of Scripture to follow "Fathers," so called, whose writings, valuable as they are in many respects, abound in puerilities, and who are in this, as in many other points, hopelessly at variance with one another.

We have asserted that Scripture affords us no instance of prayers for the dead; but we are fully aware that an attempt has been made to make 2 Tim. i. 16—18 bear this meaning. The apostle there prays that the Lord may grant mercy to the house of Onesiphorus, an expression not found elsewhere, but from his household being also alluded to in chap. iv. 19, as well as from the peculiar wish in verse 18,—“May the Lord grant to him to find mercy from the Lord in that day,” the day of judgment,—it has been supposed that Onesiphorus was dead, and hence verse 18 has been paraded as a much wished-for proof of the practice of prayers for the dead.

The conclusion is an illogical one,—a small peg on which to hang such a dogma or practice. It may be that Onesiphorus was not with the apostle at the time, as Theodoret and Chrysostom imagine, and the use of the aorists is not of so much weight in arguing against this as Dean Alford in his *Commentary* is disposed to allow. It may have been that Onesiphorus was away from his family and under some affliction elsewhere, which would explain the prayer of the apostle. It may have been that Onesiphorus, the faithful friend of the apostle, had sadly fallen into some sin,—not unto death, but which brought disgrace on his character and family; and the apostle would remind Timothy of his former good deeds. It may have been that poor Onesiphorus had faltered in faith, and fallen into some of the pit-falls of Satan. It may allude to almost anything; and we are not bound to explain allusions left unexplained by the apostle, but it is monstrous to put force upon it, in order to give an apostolic colouring to a practice which, if apostolic, we must have heard of in other passages of Holy Writ.

We have now to consider the famous passage in the First Epistle of Peter iii. 18—20, which is the stronghold of those who hold peculiar views respecting the state of the dead in the intermediate state. We quote it from our Authorized Version, and shall afterwards notice the suggested alterations of rendering. “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.”

Roman Catholic divines are never tired of quoting this passage in defence of their doctrines of purgatory or of *Limbus Patrum*. We meet it cited in almost every book, large or small, written in defence of those dogmas. Now be it carefully noted that, the persons preached to were the sinners who perished by the waters of the deluge; sinners of a most inveterate type, upon whom the warnings of Noah had no effect. The Church of Rome informs us that the souls of the righteous who died before Christ were confined in what she calls *Limbus Patrum*, until Christ died on the cross, and descending into Hades, released them from their imprisonment. But even were we to grant such a notion (which has no Scripture warrant whatever), this passage cannot by any possibility refer to such a prison, or to the souls confined in it. For the antediluvians of Noah's age were not Old Testament believers, but Old Testament reprobates. Nor can "the prison" of St. Peter's Epistle, consistently with Romish doctrine, be held to mean purgatory. Purgatory, according to the Council of Trent, is supposed to be a place where "the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal home, 'into which nothing defiled entereth.'" But the antediluvian sinners were not just men defiled with sins of weakness or of ignorance, but obstinate and hardened sinners who were cut off in, what would be styled in Romish phraseology, "mortal sin." Of antediluvian sinners, and of them only, does the passage speak when it says—"Christ preached to the spirits in prison."

The Lutheran divines also are generally noted for holding peculiar views respecting Christ's descent into hell, which they usually support by a reference to this passage; because if this passage can be shewn not to allude to that event, there is no other part of Scripture from which any fair deduction can be drawn respecting what took place between Christ's death and resurrection.

The article of Christ's descent into hell is referred to both in the first and second part of the *Formula Concordiæ*. It is there stated that there was much difference of opinion among the theologians who professed the Augsburg Confession, how, or in what manner, and at what time Christ descended into hell. Nothing is decided in the first part regarding the various opinions referred to. The Formula only states that the article cannot be understood by our senses or reason, but must be accepted by faith. It recommends, therefore, that there should be no discussion about the question, but that the article should be believed and taught as simply as possible. In the second part it is more distinctly laid down:—"We therefore believe simply that Christ

in his whole person, God and man, after his burial descended into hell, vanquished Satan, overturned the power of hell, and took away from the devil all strength and power." But nothing is asserted in any of the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church as to the mode in which Christ accomplished this result.

Luther himself, however, has expressed his opinion about the point a little more clearly. I know, says he, "that Christ himself, personally, has destroyed hell and has bound the devil," and "that all the devils ran and fled before him as before their death and poison." Hollaz taught,—and this we believe to be the common Lutheran idea,—that Christ descended into hell "in order to shew himself as the Conqueror of death to the wicked spirits and the damned souls."

Now all these interpretations of the article in the Creed are grounded on this very passage of St. Peter, although several other texts are cited to throw light upon its more obscure portions.

We must not forget that this sense, too, was put upon the passage in the Articles of the Church of England published in King Edward the Sixth's reign, but happily omitted from the present Thirty-nine Articles:—"That the body of Christ lay in the grave until his resurrection: but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in prison, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in St. Peter testifieth."

We need scarcely remark that the passage in its very form utterly precludes such a meaning from being, on any sound principle of interpretation, extracted from it. Christ's preaching, wherever and whenever it took place, is in the text limited to those persons who were disobedient in the days of Noah. We must insist upon the point, that from this passage alone we have no right to infer that he preached to others. There are other objections which are of weight against both the views stated above, but we purposely waive their discussion at present.

Another view of this passage has been proposed, which has had defenders almost in every time,* and which Dean Alford

* Dean Alford asserts that this is the view of the great majority of commentators,—ancient and modern. It may be so; but it must not be forgotten that the ancient commentators consist chiefly of the Fathers, whose minds were warped by superstitious fancies of every kind, and whose judgment is consequently of little value in such a question. The modern commentators referred to consist principally of those orthodox German theologians, who have felt themselves bound as far as possible to support the opinions of Luther and of their Church, by which an unnecessary mystery has been thrown over the simple article of Christ's descent into the realms of the dead. Most of the rationalistic commentators, too, adopt the same view of the passage, from a too evident desire to graft upon Scripture notions which seem, at least at first sight, to partake of the spirit of the legends of the middle ages. The majority, however, of orthodox Protestant divines since the Reformation (the Lutherans in general being excepted), have rejected this interpretation.

will have to be its only possible meaning. It is, "that our Lord in his disembodied state did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce his work of redemption,—preach salvation in fact, to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the flood was hanging over them.

Bishop Horsley is one of the most noted of the English theologians who has adopted this view. He admits that "the great difficulty in the description of the souls to whom this preaching for this purpose was addressed, is this; that they were the souls of some of the antediluvian race." Yet he proceeds to say:—

"Not that it at all startles me to find antediluvian souls in safe keeping for final salvation. On the contrary, I should find it very difficult to believe (unless I read it somewhere in the Bible), that of the millions^d that perished in the general deluge, all died hardened in impenitence and unbelief; insomuch that not one of that race could be an object of future mercy, beside the eight persons who were miraculously saved in the ark, for the purpose of repopulating the depopulated earth But the great difficulty, of which, perhaps, I may be unable to give any adequate solution, is this: For what reason should the proclamation of the finishing of the great work of redemption be addressed exclusively to the souls of these antediluvian penitents? Were not the souls of the penitents of later ages equally interested in the joyful tidings? To this I can only answer, that I think I have observed, in some parts of Scripture, an anxiety—if the expression may be allowed—of the sacred writers to convey distinct intimations, that the antediluvian race is not uninterested in the redemption, and the final retribution. It is for this purpose, as I conceive, that, in the description of the general resurrection, in the visions of the Apocalypse, it is mentioned, with a peculiar emphasis, that the 'SEA gave up the dead that were in it;' which I cannot be content to understand of the few persons, few in comparison of the total of mankind, lost at different times by shipwreck; a poor circumstance to find a place in the midst of the magnificent images which surround it; but of the myriads who perished in the general deluge, and found their tomb in the waters of the raging ocean."^e

We cannot but regard Bishop Horsley's attempted solution of the difficulty to which he alludes, as eminently unsatisfactory. The counter-difficulty he raises against the common opinion that the antediluvian sinners were finally lost, is just the objection which has ever been brought against any wholesale condemnation of the wicked at all. We think that the conclusions at which we arrived in our last paper moderate the force of this objection; we do not pretend that they completely remove it.

^d It is not at all necessary to suppose that millions perished by the flood. However, this is a question which it is out of our present purpose to discuss.

^e Bishop Horsley's sermon *On Christ's Descent into Hell, and the Intermediate State*, appended to his *Translation of Hosea, with notes explanatory and critical*. London: 1804.

But there is this much to be said of Horsley's view, which is worthy of high commendation, and that is, he does not strain the text beyond its plain statements. Whatever be intended to be conveyed thereby, the preaching of Christ in the text is limited to the antediluvian prisoners, and to such Horsley is willing to limit it.

Mr. Ker^f is a commentator of quite a different school. The conclusions which a Horsley feels he cannot make, a Ker has no hesitation to draw. In pages 84, 85, 86 of his treatise, the little difficulty that the antediluvian dead are alone mentioned, is very quietly not alluded to at all. However, on page 133, an attempt is made to grapple with it. He there says:—

“It is true that this preaching seems to have been limited to those of Noah's days. But no good or just reason can be assigned why the limitation should be so insisted on, as to exclude the belief that others might also experience a similar grace. Once admit the principle that there is hope for *any* of the departed, and we are justified in extending that blessed hope to *all* who have in every age, or in any age, departed this life in involuntary ignorance of the Saviour. I say ‘involuntary,’ because, as I have often and earnestly impressed upon you, for those who depart this life in the *wilful* rejection of Christ, the Scripture holds out no hope of any kind.”

We will not stop to expose fully the want of logical reason which characterizes the above. Our argument against all similar expositions of the place under consideration is: Peter, in his Epistle, limits the preaching of Christ, at the time referred to by him, to the antediluvian apostates. But no good or just reason can be assigned why the antediluvian sinners should be deemed worthy, above all others, of that mercy being offered to them in the intermediate state which Scripture does not warrant us to say is offered to others. Therefore there is an *à priori* presumption that, on a careful examination, the preaching of Christ referred to will be found to have taken place in this world, and is to be identified with the preaching of Noah, who is also alluded to in the very passage itself.

If, of course, it be logical to draw a conclusion from the particular to the universal, and assert that what is stated to refer to *some* refers to *all*, if we are to introduce our surmises to fill up the gaps left in Scripture, unquestionably then, but not till then, our whole line of argument is proved to be invalid.

Dean Alford is more cautious in his expressions, but no less

^f *The Popular Ideas of Immortality, Everlasting Punishment, and the State of Separate Souls, brought to the test of Scripture.* A series of discourses by the Rev. William Ker, M.A., Incumbent of Tipton. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1865.

surely tends to the result at which Mr. Ker has arrived, which Mr. Barlow accepts as dogmatic truth, and which all the advocates of this interpretation feel to be more or less required in order to render their view tenable.

Dean Alford indeed rounds the corner very nicely, and hints what he feels he cannot broadly assert.

"Why these [the antediluvian transgressors] rather than others are mentioned—whether merely as a *sample of a like gracious work on others*, or for some special reason unimaginable by us, we cannot say. It is ours to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations as far as vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed fact. That inference every intelligent reader will draw from the fact here announced:—it is not purgatory; it is not universal restitution; but *it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice: the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it*. And as we cannot say to what other cases this κήρυγμα may have applied, so *it would be presumption in us to limit its occurrence or its efficacy*. The reason of mentioning here these sinners, above other sinners, appears to be, their connection with the type of baptism which follows. If so, *who shall say that the blessed act was confined to them?*"

The italics are our own. The process of thought in the above is very interesting to note. Horsley's notion that the reason of the preaching referred to was "some special reason unimaginable by us," is alluded to, but felt to be unsatisfactory, and hence let drop out of view. If Scripture does not lead, imagination must run ahead. Wherefore we are first informed that it may be *possible* that the antediluvian sinners were only mentioned as a *sample* of a class upon whom a gracious work is performed; then the intelligent reader, it is concluded, will not fail to draw the proper conclusion from this passage,—that in cases where the doom on earth appears too heavy for the sin it succeeds, the balance is righted in the other world. In fact, who can dare to say that, "as a man soweth, so shall he reap," for there is a hope that in the intermediate state he may obtain that mercy which he refused to accept in this world?

We hope we have not done the Dean an injustice in making these remarks. We think his words convey the meaning we have given them. The unfairness of one of his remarks is, we think, clear. He says it is presumptuous to limit the occurrence, or the efficacy, of Christ's preaching to the dead. But Peter, so far forth as may be concluded from the text, does limit it to the antediluvian transgressors; and why should they be thought presumptuous who refuse to go beyond the text, and who maintain that Scripture gives us no grounds whatever to believe that the Gospel will be offered after death to any of the human family?

If the passage in St. Peter teaches that our Lord preached in Hades the Gospel to the persons who perished in the time of Noah, then Horsley's view is the only one which we are warranted to entertain, namely, that we neither know why or wherefore the Gospel was preached to them. If Dean Alford's conjectures are admissible, we see no valid reason why the text may not with equal fairness be cited as holding out hopes of a universal restitution.

We must here notice Dean Alford's rendering of this passage, and the criticisms which he brings to bear against what, for convenience sake, we may be permitted to call the Reformation view of the passage. The Dean renders it thus :—

"Because Christ also suffered for sins once, a just person on behalf of unjust persons, that He might bring us near to God, put to death indeed in the flesh, but made alive [again] in the spirit : in which He also went and preached to the spirits in prison, which were once disobedient, when the long-suffering of God was waiting in the days of Noah while the ark was being prepared, in which a few persons, that is, eight souls, were saved by water."

His explanation of the portion under dispute is tolerably obscure.

"Christ's flesh," he says, "which was living flesh before, became dead flesh : Christ Jesus, the entire complex Person, consisting of body, soul, and spirit, was put to death *σαρκί* ['in the flesh'], but made alive [again] *in the spirit* ; here there may seem to be difficulty : but the difficulty will vanish if we guide ourselves simply and carefully by the former clause. 'Quod ad carnem,' the Lord was put to death : 'quod ad spiritum,' He was brought to life [for this, and not 'remained alive,' must be insisted on the meaning of *ἐξωρισθήναι*]. His flesh was the subject, recipient, vehicle of inflicted death : His Spirit was the subject, recipient, vehicle of restored life. But here let us beware, and proceed cautiously. What is asserted is not that the *flesh* died and the Spirit was *made alive* ; but that 'quoad' the flesh the Lord died, 'quoad' the Spirit, He was made alive. He the God-man Christ Jesus, body and soul, ceased to live in the flesh, began to live in the Spirit ; ceased to live a fleshly mortal life, began to live a spiritual resurrection life. His own Spirit never died, as the next verse shews us. 'This is the meaning, that Christ by His sufferings was taken from the life which is flesh and blood, as a man on earth, living, walking and standing in flesh and blood . . . and He is now placed in another life, and made alive according to the Spirit, has passed into a spiritual and supernatural life, which includes in itself the whole life which Christ now has in soul and body, so that He has no longer a fleshly but a spiritual body.'—Luther."

This explanation has a very mystical air about it, and if we found it in another man's book, we would suspect him of adopting the Lutheran view of the nature of our Lord's resurrection

body, which was devised to soften down the numerous difficulties which beset their doctrine of consubstantiation.

The difficulty there is in the ordinary explanation lies in the fact that the *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί*, "being put to death indeed in the flesh," in the one member of the sentence, and the *ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ Πνεύματι*, "being quickened by the Spirit," in the other, though identical constructions, and antithetical in their nature, are according to this interpretation understood in a different sense. For by the *flesh* is understood *the human flesh of Christ*, whereas the *Spirit* is not considered to mean Christ's *human soul*, but *the Holy Spirit*.

The Dean of Canterbury with his usual dogmatism asserts that "the rendering of the English Version here, '*by the Spirit*,' is wrong both grammatically and theologically," but he thinks it unnecessary either to point out the grammatical blunder or the theological error. We admit the difficulty or harshness of the Greek construction, but we assert that taking all the difficulties, critical and exegetical, into consideration, Dean Alford's interpretation is encompassed with many more difficulties than the Reformation view of the passage. If the difficulty is considered to lie in the absence of the article before *πνεύματι*, then it must be borne in mind that the *textus receptus* and other authorities have it, and that *Πνεῦμα* is used several times without the article to indicate the Holy Spirit. Although, too, when persons are referred to, *ἐν* or *διὰ* are more frequently used, instead of the simple dative of the instrument, yet it is allowable to use the latter to express the same idea.

As to the theological error, we confess we cannot see where it lies. God the Father is spoken of in several passages as having had a share in raising up Christ (Acts ii. 24, 33; Eph. i. 20; Heb. xiii. 20; unless, indeed, some of these be understood to refer to the Spirit), although it is said in other passages that Christ was raised up by his own power. Where is the theological error in considering that the Holy Spirit had also a part in that transaction? a fact, we think, pointed out forcibly in Rom. i. 4, where, however, Dean Alford also objects, but, as we consider, on insufficient grounds to the rendering of our Authorized Version.

It ought to be taken into consideration that the construction here of *σαρκί*, as well as *πνεύματι*, is unique in the New Testament; the phrase *ἐν σαρκί* or *κατὰ σαρκά* being elsewhere met instead.

The phrase *ἐν ᾧ* can be rendered either *by which*, or *in which*, or *at which time* (the last being the harshest rendering), according to the view which expositors individually may hold concern-

ing the reference of the passage in general. By *ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν* can be understood the spirits which were in prison, kept shut up in some part of Hades awaiting the judgment, in which case the text must mean that Christ preached in Hades to those spirits. Or, by "the spirits in prison" may be understood *the spirits who are in prison*, that is, who are now there, but were not there at the time of Christ's preaching to them. The notion that by the *prison* here is meant *the place of the lost* is strongly supported by the use of this expression in reference thereto in Rev. xx. 7 (comp. Matt. v. 25, and Luke xiii. 58), and by the similar expressions used in Luke xvi. 23—26; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6; Rev. xx. 3, etc. By the preaching we understand Christ's preaching by the Spirit through Noah, who in Peter's Second Epistle is called "*a preacher of righteousness*" (chap. ii. 5), agreeably to the statement, which is also Peter's, that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

It is a great support also to this exposition that the *long-suffering* of God in Noah's time is specially alluded to in the text, a reference which loses much of its force on the other interpretation being adopted.

A view, too, which has been substantially adopted by scholars such as Hammond, Beza, Lightfoot, Scaliger, and Hofmann, cannot be quite so indefensible as Dean Alford seeks to make it out, when he asserts that "it must be evident to every unprejudiced scholar, how alien such an interpretation is from the plain meaning and connection of the words and clauses."

Before we bring our remarks on this verse to a close, we must allude to the passage in chap. iv. 6, which is supposed to be closely connected with it. Happily there is but little contest about its translation, and the Authorized Version is sufficiently accurate for our purpose. "For for this cause [*i.e.*, because Christ will judge the quick and dead] was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead [or as Alford, 'to dead men also,' *i.e.*, as well as to living, which translation is also admissible], that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."

Dean Alford explains this passage as referring back to the former, with, however, the important variation, that he views the "dead," here named, to refer not only to the antediluvians, but to the dead generally. "The want of the article does not justify any limitation of this word; for the article is also wanted before *νεκρούς* in ver. 5, which indisputably is universal in its reference." His idea is that the verse means:—

"Our Lord is ready to judge the dead: and with reason: for even they have not been without opportunity of receiving his Gospel: as the

example which was adduced in chap. iii. 19 shews. For this end the Gospel was preached even to the dead, that they might—not indeed escape the universal judgment on human sin, which is physical death,—but *that they might be judged* [aor., be in the state of the completed sentence on sin, which is death after the flesh] *according to [as] man as regards the flesh* [this first clause following *iva* being the subordinate one, of the state which the *εὐηγγελίσθη* left remaining], *but* [notwithstanding] *might live* [pres. of a state to continue] *according to God* [a life with God, and divine] *as regards the spirit.*”

We have let the Dean explain himself, all the italics and brackets in this quotation being his own.

Such an exposition is against the analogy of Scripture. If it be true, it follows as a matter of course not only that the antediluvian sinners, drowned in the flood, were saved *as a body*; but, also, that what is supposed true in their case occurs commonly to all the dead. So that the dead have the Gospel proclaimed to them after death, and, as our verse would lead us to infer on this explanation, it is preached to them then with almost universal success; while the very reverse might be predicated with respect to preaching in this life. Thus, if this be the meaning of the verse, the conclusion which the Dean barely ventures to suggest in his comment on the former passage is here nakedly put forward.

Logically, we cannot stop where the Dean would wish us; we must go further. If the want of the article before the word “dead” does not justify us in limiting its application, then we may affirm the general proposition, that to the dead the Gospel will be preached after death with a view to their final salvation, and that the punishment they may have received on earth, with some temporary imprisonment in Hades, will be all that will be exacted from them. The natural result of such an interpretation is to lead us to Universalism,—a conclusion which the Dean for his part, and we on our own, consider opposed to plain passages of Holy Writ.

What is then the interpretation of this verse? There are at least two explanations between which we will not decide at the present time, which meet the exigencies of the case. Accepting as correct Dean Alford’s explanation of the clause, “judged according to man as regards the flesh,” as referring to the death which all must share, we may explain the “dead” to mean those spiritually dead in trespasses and sins, to whom the Gospel is preached in order that, while they cannot escape the death of the body, they may obtain eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. The objection to this, which Dean Alford thinks is of itself conclusive, is that “seeing that *γάρ* binds verses 5 and 6

logically together, and that *καὶ νεκροῖς* distinctly takes up the *νεκροῖς* before in this logical connection, all interpretations must be false which do not give *νεκροῖς* in verse 6 the same meaning as *νεκροῖς* in verse 5; i.e., that of *dead men*, literally and simply so called: men who have died and are in their graves." We have, however, a very notable instance of the contrary in the passage in Luke ix. 60, "Let the dead bury their dead," where the word "*dead*" is used in the same sentence in these two different significations. Comp. John v. 25, 28, 29.

Or, we may suppose that by "the dead" are meant those persons who had actually died in the faith, or some of their number who, though they had died as others in the flesh, yet had obtained the precious gift of immortal life in the spirit through Jesus Christ.

The importance of this passage of the epistle in connection with that in chap. iii. 19, 20, is that, if it refers to the same event, it proves that the antediluvians at least, *in general*, obtained salvation after death, and that the preaching of Christ to them, if that preaching took place in Hades, was effectual to their eternal deliverance.

Is there any passage of Scripture, it may then be asked, which leads us to entertain a different view regarding the individuals referred to? We think so.

First, then, let us see the character of these antediluvians as painted in Genesis,—these persons among whom Horsley and others incline to think there were not a few misguided believers, and whose case they regard as one of those dark enigmas of the divine justice in which "the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which had incurred it."

Scripture is plain enough, and leads us to infer that if ever people deserved destruction, the then inhabitants of the world did so. What else means the statement, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen vi. 5)? or, "The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth" (verses 11, 12; see also ver. 13)?

The sixth chapter of Genesis in its earlier verses gives us the account of the origin of this terrible fall. The "sons of God" mentioned there were the professors of religion in that day, the descendants of Adam (among whom the Sethites were pre-eminent), who kept up the worship of God. Cain had separated himself, and gone away to a land eastward of Eden,

the land of Nod; the family of Seth, and the other children of Adam who adhered to them, remained in the habitation of their forefathers. There, in front of Eden, was their home; there was reared their family altar. But it would seem that, probably after the death of Cain, in the days of Enos, the son of Seth, the scattered members of all the families began again to associate in sacred rites before the ancestral altar, and "to call upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. iv. 26). The professors of religion left their proper homes, and were fascinated by the arts of the daughters of men, as the Cainites were called (in much the same way as the Israelites in later days by the daughters of Midian, Numb. xxv.), first to commit whoredom with them, and afterwards to become united in matrimonial alliances. These alliances soon led to fearful irreligion and prevalent immorality.

What is meant by the Nephilim of Gen. vi. 4 cannot be decided with any degree of certainty. The word may mean *giants, robbers, tyrants, apostates*. Numbers xiii. 33 does not prove that "giants" is the right translation, and we think that translation almost meaningless here. It may be that "apostates" is here the right meaning, and that the apostates first named in the text were those who brought about the unhallowed union between the professed godly and ungodly, and the second "apostates" alluded to the children, who were the fruits of these intermarriages, who seem to have excelled their fathers in wickedness.

We reject with horror the notion advocated by some, among whom are such great names as Delitzsch and Kurtz (of "the Fathers" we make little account in such a question), that by "the sons of God"^s are meant angels who intermarried with

^s The exact expression *בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים* is not often found in the Bible. The phrase seems generally to point out not *angels* in the common acceptation of that term, but *righteous men*. Compare Hosea i. 10, where the Israelites are called *בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים*, the cognate expressions which are used in Deut. xiv. 1; Psalm lxiii. 15; Prov. xiv. 26; Isaiah i. 2; xliii. 6; Jer. iii. 19, and the common use of the phrase "*sons of God*" in the New Testament, where it is applied only to *righteous men*, and not to angels. In Job xxxviii. 7, the phrase *בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים* is indeed commonly supposed to signify *angels*; but unnecessarily. The verse runs thus, "When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." It is just as admissible to explain the phrase "*sons of God*" by the foregoing expression "*morning stars*," as to say that the latter explains the former, and that both must mean angels. The laws of Hebrew parallelism require that both expressions should bear the same signification. The passage, in our opinion, describes the stars poetically as rejoicing in chorus together at the introduction of a new planet among their number. Similar poetical figures are found in other passages of Scripture, as Isaiah xxxv. 1, 2; lv. 12, etc. The expression, "*sons of God*," in Job i. 6, and ii. 1, has been well understood by the Rev. C. H. H. Wright (in his essay on Job, contained in his *Spiritual Temple*. London: Williams and Norgate) to mean the professors of true reli-

earthly women. Such deeds of the flesh do not correspond with them, and our Lord's words in Matt. xxii. 30; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 35, 36, are decisive against the notion. It is a weak reply to say that our Lord there speaks only of what the angels do not do, and not of what they never could have done, for the Creator has implanted no desires in any of his creatures which were never designed to be satisfied.

But the punishment of these apostate sons of God,—these antediluvian transgressors,—is alluded to also by St. Peter and Jude (2 Peter ii. 4; Jude 6). The angels⁴ there mentioned as having fallen are no other than those rebels against God. In popular explanations, indeed, they are identified with the fallen angels which fell with Satan, yet it can be shewn with tolerable certainty that they ought not to be so identified. The angels in Peter and Jude are described as even now in a state of darkness and confinement, in a place called Tartarus, reserved against the punishment of the great day of the Lord, while the angels which fell with Satan are mentioned as roaming about our earth, and believers are exhorted to contend against them. The angels in Peter and Jude are, too, identified by most expositors with "the sons of God" of Genesis. Peter gives no particulars of their sin, but Jude informs us that it consisted, at first at least,

gion in Job's days. In those very mysterious passages Satan is described as appearing in the midst of the congregation of God's worshippers, confronted there, however, by the Great Advocate of the people of God. See also Lee's *Commentary on Job*. The following note occurs in Wright's *Spiritual Temple*, p. 173. After having remarked that the exact expression *אֲנֹכִי וְאֵלֵי* only occurs in the passages which we have quoted, the note says: "Another expression *אֲנֹכִי וְאֵלֵי* is found in Psalm xxix. 1; lxxxix. 6, which has been rendered in our Authorized Version (following most of the ancient expositors) by *the mighty and the sons of the mighty*, and is evidently referred to the kings and mighty men of the earth. A comparison of Psalm xxix. 1, with Psalm xcvi. 7, is strongly in favour of this view. Nor is there anything very decisive which can be adduced against it, though Hengstenberg and others consider it distinctly opposed by Psalm lxxxii. 6,—a passage which, we consider, has nothing whatever to say to the point. The phrase *אֲנֹכִי וְאֵלֵי* may be rendered '*sons of God*,' but, even so, it is not identical with *אֲנֹכִי וְאֵלֵי*. In this signification it may also be understood (in the passages in question of the Psalms) to refer to the righteous, the professing worshippers of God, or the saints of the earth. Psalm xxix. 1 can easily enough bear this meaning. Psalm lxxxix. 6 is not quite so clear. But in the fifth verse of that Psalm we have the angels in heaven and the saints on earth contrasted together; and so, likewise, in the seventh verse we have the same parallelism, though reversed. Surely it would suit the contrast better to regard the distinction as also existing in the sixth verse, than to suppose that the angels of heaven are to be understood in both the members of that verse? The contrast is also preserved intact in all the verses, if by the *אֲנֹכִי וְאֵלֵי* be understood, according to the view of the ancient expositors, *the mighty men*, or *kings*, of the earth."

⁴ In Rev. xii. 7, 11, we have the name *angels* used of Christian men. See verses 11, 12 of that passage: also compare Rev. xxii. 8, 9.

chiefly in fornication. The seventh verse of his epistle runs as follows: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them [about Sodom and Gomorrah, to wit, Admah and Zeboim] following fornication in like manner to these," *i. e.*, the angels formerly mentioned, "are set forth as an example," etc. Now the sin of "the sons of God" was first that of contracting unholy marriages (if marriages they were at first, for Gen. vi. 4 leads us to conjecture that they were not so), even as the sin of the angels here is said to have consisted in fornication. The angels in Jude are further said to have "kept not their first estate," or "dignity," but to have "left their own habitation," or "their proper habitation," even as we have shewn "the sons of God" did.

But view them as identical, and what is the result? That we have positive Scripture warrant in asserting that the earlier rebels against God were punished not only with the death of their bodies, but with the eternal destruction of their souls. But Gen. vi. 4, 5, tells us plainly that the sin of their descendants was even greater than their own, and that the world grew riper for punishment instead of improving in virtue.

Place alongside of this conclusion then the fact that *if* 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20, and 1 Pet. iv. 6, teach that Christ preached in Hades to these antediluvians, they teach likewise that, at least, the great body of them were saved there, which is contrary to the conclusion we have arrived at above.

And, also, that *if* the common Reformation view of those passages be abandoned, Scripture then teaches not only, as Dean Alford, Mr. Barlow, and Mr. Ker believe, that there is a hope of the salvation of the heathen, but also that there is a hope of salvation for the majority of mankind, if not for all, on the other side of the grave.

Either, too, the passages in Peter must be understood in some such way as we have interpreted them, or we shall be driven to hold that angels have fleshly feelings as we have, with this difference, that there is no provision made for their lawfully gratifying the same.

But each or any of the above conclusions, which we must adopt if we deny the ordinary Protestant interpretation, are full of difficulties, and we arrive therefore at the conviction in the end, that the theological and exegetical difficulties which beset Dean Alford's view of the passages referred to vastly surpass all the critical difficulties (which are not in themselves conclusive) against the common interpretation. Q. E. D.

The state of the soul after death is a final one, and Scripture affords us no grounds to imagine that any change in character

will be made from bad to good, or the reverse, in the intermediate state.

It does appear from the passages we have cited during our investigation, that the popular theology is mistaken at least in its nomenclature. In ordinary language, the righteous are said to go to heaven immediately after death, and the wicked to hell, whereas Scripture, we have seen, teaches us that both go to an intermediate place, called by the name of Hades, which is divided into two distinct compartments; the one the region of the blessed, termed Paradise, or Abraham's bosom; the other, the place of the condemned, Tartarus, after the name given to that place by the Greeks, 2 Pet. ii. 4. Hence our Lord speaks of himself after his resurrection as not yet having ascended into heaven, John xx. 17, although his soul was in Paradise after his death upon the cross.

This popular mistake, however, is but a trivial one, as by heaven in such popular language is meant a place of blessedness, which Paradise is, and hell is similarly used to indicate a place of misery, which Tartarus also must be. The apostle's expression, too, in 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4, seems to favour the popular view of the identity of Paradise and heaven, although the words may even there be understood of two distinct places.

From the doom pronounced on the wicked when consigned to their proper abode, and from the joy granted to the righteous, we have seen there is no escape or falling away. The misery and the blessedness of each are final, though Scripture tells us they will be increased at the judgment of the great day.

It would appear, too, to be a fair deduction from the language of Scripture that there is no egress from Hades permitted to the righteous or the wicked. For Scripture tells us that at the last day Hades shall deliver up the dead, righteous and unrighteous, which shall then be found in it, Rev. xx. 13. In verses 2, 3, of the same chapter it is said that Satan, when confined in Tartarus, before the great judgment, shall not be able to break forth, and this statement, taken in connection with the passages in 2 Peter and Jude, we have already discussed, leads us to infer that all the wicked confined there are likewise unable to come forth from their prison house. The statement of the prophet Isaiah, in chap. xxiv. 21, leads us to the same conclusion. It is as follows:—"The Lord shall punish in that day the host of the high ones that are on high," *i.e.*, the wicked angels that take part with the Lord's adversaries, "and the kings of the earth that are upon the earth," the manifested opponents of God's kingdom. "And they (the latter, or perhaps both of them) shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered

together in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited." The prison here spoken of is the prison of Hades, where they are to be confined in chains and darkness; and the visitation predicted after many days is a visitation of wrath, namely, being brought forth to receive their final sentence before the bar of the Eternal God. The word used in the original for "visited" is *יָפְקַד*; and, as Delitzsch has shewn, in his *Commentary* on Isaiah, *יָפְקַד* is only used of a visitation of judgment. Compare Isaiah xxix. 6; Ez. xxxviii. 8. Gesenius, Umbreit, Böhl, and others, coincide in this view, though Hitzig, Knobel, and Ewald, take the opposite view of the passage.

Zechariah ix. 11, 12, has been adduced by some as a proof of the righteous souls being similarly restrained from leaving Hades, while they are said to enjoy peace and happiness there. But "the prisoners" alluded to in that passage are the exiles of Judah and Jerusalem, and their "prison house," as Hitzig and Maurer well explain it, the foreign land from whence they will return. Pits empty of water, or empty wells, were used anciently for prisons, Gen. xxxvii. 24, and into such a pit Jeremiah was thrown as a captive, Jer. xxxviii. 6. Hence the expression *בֵּית הַבּוֹר*, "the house of a pit," was used to denote a prison, Exod. xii. 29, Jer. xxxvii. 16.

Some instances, however, are said to be mentioned in Scripture of souls in their disembodied state revisiting this earth. Moses appeared with Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration in converse with our Lord, and this is an example that cannot well be gainsayed, as it is quite a gratuitous assumption to suppose that Moses' body was raised from the dead for the occasion.

The second case brought forward is one of a more doubtful character, namely the real or assumed appearance of Samúel to Saul recorded in 1 Sam. xxviii. Mr. Ker in his book, and the late venerable Rev. G. S. Faber, in his curious and interesting work on *The Many Mansions*, maintain, with many others, that it is impossible to understand the narrative otherwise than asserting a real appearance, if we admit its credibility and inspiration.

It may be admitted, as Thenius has well put forward, that the witch of Endor knew well who Saul was, notwithstanding his disguise. His lofty stature and noble appearance made it hard for him effectually to preserve his *incognito*. Hence the woman first secured herself from harm by exacting a solemn oath from him, before she proceeded to try her art. But if the appearance of Samuel was not a real one, many difficulties pre-

sent themselves for solution. Why should the woman have predicted such a terrible end, when the object of such persons is mainly to please those who have recourse to them? If she spoke so from motives of revenge, and from a wish to exult over the man who had once acted severely towards those of her profession, still how could she know thus exactly not only the result of the next day's battle (which perhaps she might have conjectured from the dejection of the king), but the minuter points of his death and that of his sons? The 14th verse certainly seems to carry the meaning that Saul beheld the spectre, for he saluted it in the oriental manner. (Thenius does not seem to regard this as a difficulty in the way of adopting his view, as he does not comment on it.) Not till the spectre had ceased speaking did Saul cast himself on the ground. It is admitted by those who uphold the real appearance of Samuel, that he was not raised by the magical arts of the woman, who intended merely to deceive, but by the power of God; and that the woman herself was terrified at the appearance, and *screamed out* for fear (ver. 12) when she beheld what she thought at first was the apparition of God ascending out of the earth. She had placed the king in some outward room with the intention to deceive him by the arts of some confederate; now she beheld with alarm a real appearance from the dead. Thenius, on the other hand, explains the cry of the woman to be only feigned, and designed to terrify Saul. Ewald, however, regards the cry to have been one of terror.

We regard those arguments against the reality of the appearances which are drawn from considerations of the strangeness of this mode of dealing with Saul as of little weight, and we cannot but confess that we are inclined to agree with Mr. Faber and Mr. Ker; although we must demur to their positive statements on the point, being disposed to consider the matter as by no means so very conclusive, notwithstanding all that has been brought forward in favour of their view.

Mr. Ker strangely regards "the Scripture evidence for the possibility of the ungodly departed overpassing the barriers of the unseen world as much stronger" than that respecting the righteous. Unknown to himself, as it seems, he has adopted the same view of demoniacal possession as that advocated by Faber, in his work to which we have referred. That view is, that by demons are meant evil spirits which once upon earth tenanted human bodies. The view is not, indeed, a new one, but has been put forward by other writers at various times. Justin Martyr and Athenagoras, quoted by Faber, both held the same view, and the latter believed that the demons were the

souls of the antediluvian giants. Faber, on the other hand, regards them rather to be "indiscriminately the wicked dead."

It is, we think, clear that the word "demons" does mean in several passages of Scripture disembodied human spirits, who were worshipped as mediators in defiance of the Biblical doctrine that there is but "one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. ii. 5). Joseph Mede has elaborately worked out this point in his treatise on the *Apostasy of the Latter Times*. But we doubt much whether there is any clear evidence of the word being used in Scripture in the sense of malignant human spirits in their disembodied state.

There is Scriptural evidence enough of the plurality of fallen angels (see Matt. xxv. 41; Eph. vi. 12; Rom. viii. 18; Col. ii. 15), and it is singular that they are not called by the name *διαβόλοι* at all, but are spoken of in various other ways. Satan himself is called the prince of the demons (Matt. xii. 24), and victory over them is said to be victory over him (Luke x. 18), while he is styled at the same time the "Prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii. 2), and he and his angels are described as roving up and down in this world, while the lost spirits of the human race when spoken of, in all undisputed passages, are described as in prison, under darkness, in the prison house, and unable to escape their awful lot even for a season (Luke xvi. 26). These facts lead us to infer that the demons, when spoken of in an evil sense, are really identical with what we call devils. Compare also James ii. 19; iii. 15, where it is difficult to suppose disembodied human spirits to be spoken of.

But we must draw our paper to a close. Man in the intermediate state seems to exist not as a simple spirit, but as a spirit combined with matter. This conclusion seems to be a just one from the *visibility* of the recorded appearance of Moses, from that of Samuel, and from the mutual visibility ascribed to Abraham, Lazarus, and Dives in Hades. Faber in his *Many Mansions* has some interesting remarks on this subject.

To the same book also we would refer those who are interested in the discussion of the locality of the intermediate state of disembodied human spirits, only mentioning that the conclusion at which Mr. Faber arrives (and we beg our readers to note that we neither express our approval or disapproval of it) is that that region is described in Scripture as being beneath the surface of this our earth.

M.A. TRIN. COLL. DUB.

EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA ON THE STAR.

THE tract which I now offer to the readers of *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, is ascribed to Eusebius of Cæsarea; and there is no reason, so far as I can see, to doubt the correctness of the statement. It is entitled: *Concerning the Star; showing how and through what the Magi recognized the Star, and that Joseph did not take Mary as his wife*. Consequently, it stands in a certain connection both with parts of the *Chronicle* and with the *Quæstiones*, edited by Mai in his *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, t. i., and his *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, t. iv., p. 219 foll.

This tract is, I believe, now published for the first time. The Greek original appears to have perished; and the Syriac fragment *De stella quæ Magis apparuit*, given by Mai in the *Nova Patrum Bibl.*, t. iv., p. 281, is evidently extracted from a different work. I have taken it from a manuscript in the Nitrian collection, Add. 17,142, a small octavo volume of seventeen leaves, dating apparently from the sixth century. The text, which I have reproduced as faithfully as possible, is, I am sorry to say, very corrupt; but I shall endeavour to correct at least some of the mistakes in the notes to the translation, which I hope to publish in the next number of this Journal.

WILLIAM WRIGHT.

24th March, 1866.

رحلہ مصحف

[illegible]

^j The rest of this page (about seventeen lines) has been purposely effaced.

11

මෙ . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි කළ . අනෙකුත්
 කළ හා කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි කළ . මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි කළ මෙවැනි
 . කළ . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි
 , මෙවැනි : මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි
 (fol. 12 vers.) මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි
 . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි
 . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි මෙවැනි
 , මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි
 (fol. 13 rect.) මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි
 මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි මෙවැනි . කළ මෙවැනි

[illegible]

c

[illegible]

^c Originally **مَدِينَة**, the **ة** being a later addition.

[illegible]

^b Originally **علاوة**.

١ : ٢ : ٣ : ٤ : ٥ : ٦ : ٧ : ٨ : ٩ : ١٠ : ١١ : ١٢ : ١٣ : ١٤ : ١٥ : ١٦ : ١٧ : ١٨ : ١٩ : ٢٠ : ٢١ : ٢٢ : ٢٣ : ٢٤ : ٢٥ : ٢٦ : ٢٧ : ٢٨ : ٢٩ : ٣٠ : ٣١ : ٣٢ : ٣٣ : ٣٤ : ٣٥ : ٣٦ : ٣٧ : ٣٨ : ٣٩ : ٤٠ : ٤١ : ٤٢ : ٤٣ : ٤٤ : ٤٥ : ٤٦ : ٤٧ : ٤٨ : ٤٩ : ٥٠ : ٥١ : ٥٢ : ٥٣ : ٥٤ : ٥٥ : ٥٦ : ٥٧ : ٥٨ : ٥٩ : ٦٠ : ٦١ : ٦٢ : ٦٣ : ٦٤ : ٦٥ : ٦٦ : ٦٧ : ٦٨ : ٦٩ : ٧٠ : ٧١ : ٧٢ : ٧٣ : ٧٤ : ٧٥ : ٧٦ : ٧٧ : ٧٨ : ٧٩ : ٨٠ : ٨١ : ٨٢ : ٨٣ : ٨٤ : ٨٥ : ٨٦ : ٨٧ : ٨٨ : ٨٩ : ٩٠ : ٩١ : ٩٢ : ٩٣ : ٩٤ : ٩٥ : ٩٦ : ٩٧ : ٩٨ : ٩٩ : ١٠٠ : ١٠١ : ١٠٢ : ١٠٣ : ١٠٤ : ١٠٥ : ١٠٦ : ١٠٧ : ١٠٨ : ١٠٩ : ١١٠ : ١١١ : ١١٢ : ١١٣ : ١١٤ : ١١٥ : ١١٦ : ١١٧ : ١١٨ : ١١٩ : ١٢٠ : ١٢١ : ١٢٢ : ١٢٣ : ١٢٤ : ١٢٥ : ١٢٦ : ١٢٧ : ١٢٨ : ١٢٩ : ١٣٠ : ١٣١ : ١٣٢ : ١٣٣ : ١٣٤ : ١٣٥ : ١٣٦ : ١٣٧ : ١٣٨ : ١٣٩ : ١٤٠ : ١٤١ : ١٤٢ : ١٤٣ : ١٤٤ : ١٤٥ : ١٤٦ : ١٤٧ : ١٤٨ : ١٤٩ : ١٥٠ : ١٥١ : ١٥٢ : ١٥٣ : ١٥٤ : ١٥٥ : ١٥٦ : ١٥٧ : ١٥٨ : ١٥٩ : ١٦٠ : ١٦١ : ١٦٢ : ١٦٣ : ١٦٤ : ١٦٥ : ١٦٦ : ١٦٧ : ١٦٨ : ١٦٩ : ١٧٠ : ١٧١ : ١٧٢ : ١٧٣ : ١٧٤ : ١٧٥ : ١٧٦ : ١٧٧ : ١٧٨ : ١٧٩ : ١٨٠ : ١٨١ : ١٨٢ : ١٨٣ : ١٨٤ : ١٨٥ : ١٨٦ : ١٨٧ : ١٨٨ : ١٨٩ : ١٩٠ : ١٩١ : ١٩٢ : ١٩٣ : ١٩٤ : ١٩٥ : ١٩٦ : ١٩٧ : ١٩٨ : ١٩٩ : ٢٠٠ : ٢٠١ : ٢٠٢ : ٢٠٣ : ٢٠٤ : ٢٠٥ : ٢٠٦ : ٢٠٧ : ٢٠٨ : ٢٠٩ : ٢١٠ : ٢١١ : ٢١٢ : ٢١٣ : ٢١٤ : ٢١٥ : ٢١٦ : ٢١٧ : ٢١٨ : ٢١٩ : ٢٢٠ : ٢٢١ : ٢٢٢ : ٢٢٣ : ٢٢٤ : ٢٢٥ : ٢٢٦ : ٢٢٧ : ٢٢٨ : ٢٢٩ : ٢٣٠ : ٢٣١ : ٢٣٢ : ٢٣٣ : ٢٣٤ : ٢٣٥ : ٢٣٦ : ٢٣٧ : ٢٣٨ : ٢٣٩ : ٢٤٠ : ٢٤١ : ٢٤٢ : ٢٤٣ : ٢٤٤ : ٢٤٥ : ٢٤٦ : ٢٤٧ : ٢٤٨ : ٢٤٩ : ٢٥٠ : ٢٥١ : ٢٥٢ : ٢٥٣ : ٢٥٤ : ٢٥٥ : ٢٥٦ : ٢٥٧ : ٢٥٨ : ٢٥٩ : ٢٦٠ : ٢٦١ : ٢٦٢ : ٢٦٣ : ٢٦٤ : ٢٦٥ : ٢٦٦ : ٢٦٧ : ٢٦٨ : ٢٦٩ : ٢٧٠ : ٢٧١ : ٢٧٢ : ٢٧٣ : ٢٧٤ : ٢٧٥ : ٢٧٦ : ٢٧٧ : ٢٧٨ : ٢٧٩ : ٢٨٠ : ٢٨١ : ٢٨٢ : ٢٨٣ : ٢٨٤ : ٢٨٥ : ٢٨٦ : ٢٨٧ : ٢٨٨ : ٢٨٩ : ٢٩٠ : ٢٩١ : ٢٩٢ : ٢٩٣ : ٢٩٤ : ٢٩٥ : ٢٩٦ : ٢٩٧ : ٢٩٨ : ٢٩٩ : ٣٠٠ : ٣٠١ : ٣٠٢ : ٣٠٣ : ٣٠٤ : ٣٠٥ : ٣٠٦ : ٣٠٧ : ٣٠٨ : ٣٠٩ : ٣١٠ : ٣١١ : ٣١٢ : ٣١٣ : ٣١٤ : ٣١٥ : ٣١٦ : ٣١٧ : ٣١٨ : ٣١٩ : ٣٢٠ : ٣٢١ : ٣٢٢ : ٣٢٣ : ٣٢٤ : ٣٢٥ : ٣٢٦ : ٣٢٧ : ٣٢٨ : ٣٢٩ : ٣٣٠ : ٣٣١ : ٣٣٢ : ٣٣٣ : ٣٣٤ : ٣٣٥ : ٣٣٦ : ٣٣٧ : ٣٣٨ : ٣٣٩ : ٣٤٠ : ٣٤١ : ٣٤٢ : ٣٤٣ : ٣٤٤ : ٣٤٥ : ٣٤٦ : ٣٤٧ : ٣٤٨ : ٣٤٩ : ٣٥٠ : ٣٥١ : ٣٥٢ : ٣٥٣ : ٣٥٤ : ٣٥٥ : ٣٥٦ : ٣٥٧ : ٣٥٨ : ٣٥٩ : ٣٦٠ : ٣٦١ : ٣٦٢ : ٣٦٣ : ٣٦٤ : ٣٦٥ : ٣٦٦ : ٣٦٧ : ٣٦٨ : ٣٦٩ : ٣٧٠ : ٣٧١ : ٣٧٢ : ٣٧٣ : ٣٧٤ : ٣٧٥ : ٣٧٦ : ٣٧٧ : ٣٧٨ : ٣٧٩ : ٣٨٠ : ٣٨١ : ٣٨٢ : ٣٨٣ : ٣٨٤ : ٣٨٥ : ٣٨٦ : ٣٨٧ : ٣٨٨ : ٣٨٩ : ٣٩٠ : ٣٩١ : ٣٩٢ : ٣٩٣ : ٣٩٤ : ٣٩٥ : ٣٩٦ : ٣٩٧ : ٣٩٨ : ٣٩٩ : ٤٠٠ : ٤٠١ : ٤٠٢ : ٤٠٣ : ٤٠٤ : ٤٠٥ : ٤٠٦ : ٤٠٧ : ٤٠٨ : ٤٠٩ : ٤١٠ : ٤١١ : ٤١٢ : ٤١٣ : ٤١٤ : ٤١٥ : ٤١٦ : ٤١٧ : ٤١٨ : ٤١٩ : ٤٢٠ : ٤٢١ : ٤٢٢ : ٤٢٣ : ٤٢٤ : ٤٢٥ : ٤٢٦ : ٤٢٧ : ٤٢٨ : ٤٢٩ : ٤٣٠ : ٤٣١ : ٤٣٢ : ٤٣٣ : ٤٣٤ : ٤٣٥ : ٤٣٦ : ٤٣٧ : ٤٣٨ : ٤٣٩ : ٤٤٠ : ٤٤١ : ٤٤٢ : ٤٤٣ : ٤٤٤ : ٤٤٥ : ٤٤٦ : ٤٤٧ : ٤٤٨ : ٤٤٩ : ٤٥٠ : ٤٥١ : ٤٥٢ : ٤٥٣ : ٤٥٤ : ٤٥٥ : ٤٥٦ : ٤٥٧ : ٤٥٨ : ٤٥٩ : ٤٦٠ : ٤٦١ : ٤٦٢ : ٤٦٣ : ٤٦٤ : ٤٦٥ : ٤٦٦ : ٤٦٧ : ٤٦٨ : ٤٦٩ : ٤٧٠ : ٤٧١ : ٤٧٢ : ٤٧٣ : ٤٧٤ : ٤٧٥ : ٤٧٦ : ٤٧٧ : ٤٧٨ : ٤٧٩ : ٤٨٠ : ٤٨١ : ٤٨٢ : ٤٨٣ : ٤٨٤ : ٤٨٥ : ٤٨٦ : ٤٨٧ : ٤٨٨ : ٤٨٩ : ٤٩٠ : ٤٩١ : ٤٩٢ : ٤٩٣ : ٤٩٤ : ٤٩٥ : ٤٩٦ : ٤٩٧ : ٤٩٨ : ٤٩٩ : ٥٠٠ : ٥٠١ : ٥٠٢ : ٥٠٣ : ٥٠٤ : ٥٠٥ : ٥٠٦ : ٥٠٧ : ٥٠٨ : ٥٠٩ : ٥١٠ : ٥١١ : ٥١٢ : ٥١٣ : ٥١٤ : ٥١٥ : ٥١٦ : ٥١٧ : ٥١٨ : ٥١٩ : ٥٢٠ : ٥٢١ : ٥٢٢ : ٥٢٣ : ٥٢٤ : ٥٢٥ : ٥٢٦ : ٥٢٧ : ٥٢٨ : ٥٢٩ : ٥٣٠ : ٥٣١ : ٥٣٢ : ٥٣٣ : ٥٣٤ : ٥٣٥ : ٥٣٦ : ٥٣٧ : ٥٣٨ : ٥

[illegible]

* Originally |لعللعل, both the ل and the points being later additions.

EXEGESIS OF DIFFICULT TEXTS.

ACTS xxi. 38.

WINER, followed by Alford, objects to the rendering of οὐκ ἄρα by "nonne igitur," which is adopted by the Authorized Version, and renders the word "non igitur." "Thou art not then (as I thought, but now see contradicted) that Egyptian." Yet if an Egyptian Jew could not speak *Greek*, we should be glad to know what language he would be likely to speak. Egypt was the birthplace of the Septuagint version, and the very cradle of Hellenism. Thus scholarship—for οὐκ ἄρα is regularly used as Winer says—and the logical sense of the sentence appear to come into a distinct opposition, out of which no one has as yet, to our knowledge, rescued them by the only legitimate method, that of discovering and quoting passages from ancient authors, which give a decisive turn to the balance in one direction or the other. This, however, we think it is now in our power to do, and that from no less an authority than Æschines the orator.

In § 20 of the oration against Ctesiphon we find the following passage: *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τὴν βουλὴν τὴν ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ ἐγγράφειν πρὸς τοὺς λογιστὰς ὁ νόμος κελεύει λόγον καὶ εὐθύναις δίδοναι, κ.τ.λ. Οὐκ ἄρα στεφανωθήσεται ἡ βουλὴ ἢ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου; οὐδὲ γὰρ πάτριον αὐτοῖς ἐστίν. Οὐκ ἄρα φιλοτιμοῦνται; πάντῃ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀγαπῶσιν, ἐάν τις παρ' αὐτοῖς μὴ ἀδικῇ, ἀλλ' ἐάν τις ἐξαμαρτάνῃ κολάζουσιν.* "For firstly the law orders the council in Areopagus to give in an account to the auditors in writing, and to submit to an audit. Shall therefore the council of Areopagus not be crowned? No, for it is not an ancestral custom for them to be so. Are they not therefore actuated by patriotic feelings? Yes, very much so, nay, they are not contented, if any one in their number be free from actual guilt; but if any one be in error, they punish him." It certainly appears to us then a question is asked in an excited manner by οὐκ ἄρα in the above just as it is by ἄρα in § 182 of the same oration: *ἀχάριστος ἄρ' ἦν ὁ δῆμος; οὐκ, ἀλλὰ μεγαλόφρων.* "Was therefore the people ungrateful? No, but magnanimous."

It is remarkable, too, that of the above two questions asked by οὐκ ἄρα, the first is met by a negative and the second by an affirmative answer.

We translate with great confidence: "Paul saith to the chiliarch, May I say something to thee? And he said, Thou knowest Greek; art thou not then after all (ἄρα) the Egyptian?" etc.

ROMANS i. 1.

When St. Paul speaks of himself as *ἀφωρισμένος εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, it appears to us far from improbable that he intends to allude to his former position as a *Pharisee* in the Jewish church. From Epiphanius (*Hæres.*, xvi., 1) ἐλέγοντο Φαρισαῖοι διὰ τὸ ἀφωρισμένους εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων διὰ τὴν ἐβελόπερυσσῶσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς νενομισμένην. *Φαρες καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐβραϊδα ἐρμηνεύεται ἀφορισμός*; we find that the current mode of explaining the word "Pharisee" was by the Greek *ἀφορίζω*. Upon the hypothesis that St. Paul intended to allude to his altered condition of *ἀφορισμός* or "separation," there is a beauty and appositeness in the commencement of the Epistle to the Romans which does not appear to have been properly developed by any commentator, although Bengel notices the allusion to the Pharisees, and considers that Paul states himself to have been set apart not merely from the ordinary Israelites, but also from among the teachers (*e doctoribus*), a turn which appears far inferior in beauty and grace to that which we are now endeavouring to point out. "Paul a slave of Jesus Christ, a called apostle, separated (as formerly among the Jews by virtue of his sect as a Pharisee, so now) for the Gospel of God."

ROMANS iii. 30.

Singular phenomena meet the eye in this verse, which are not very easily explicable to the mind. Why should the preposition *ἐκ* be applied to the justification of the circumcised Jew, while the preposition *διὰ* is applied to that of the uncircumcised Gentile? Why too should the article be inserted between the preposition and its noun, *πίστεως*, in the case of the Gentile, while it is omitted in that of the Jew? Answers exhibiting more or less acuteness are given by various commentators to these questions, but we cannot admit that any of them have carried conviction to our mind. What if after all there be no opposition whatever intended by the writer between *ἐκ πίστεως* and *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*? What if a compound expression, *περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως*, was suggested to the mind of the apostle by τὸν *ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ* at the end of verse 26? It is pretty clear that in verse 25 *ἰλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως* is a compound expression; why should not *περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως* be one of a similar character? We should then have two classes whom God is willing to justify, *περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως*, Jews who accept the law of faith and covenant of grace instead of that of works, and Gentiles, the justification of each class being produced in the same way, viz., *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, through their faith. No question as

to the justification of Gentile converts having arisen, the words *ἐκ πίστεως* may be safely considered as implied in their case, while they are an absolutely necessary adjunct to *περιτομή* in the connection.

Again, the whole stress of the subsequent argument lies on *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, which appears to be repeated from the end of the verse on which we are commenting, and that argument certainly loses force if *ἐκ πίστεως* be opposed in the case of the Jew, who might fear the *κατάργησις* of the law, to *διὰ τῆς πίστεως* in the case of the Gentile, who had never had anything to do with the law.

The whole passage, if paraphrased so as to exhibit the argument, would perhaps run as follows, beginning at verse 27:—“Where then is vaunting? It has been excluded. Through what law? That of works? No, but through the law of faith. For we reckon that a man is justified by faith independently of the works of the law. Or is God a God of Jews only? Is he not also God of Gentiles? Yes, of Gentiles also, since one and the same is the God, who will justify (1) circumcised Jews who are of faith, and (2) uncircumcised Gentiles, in each case by means of their faith. Are we then superseding or putting an end to the law by means of the faith which we are preaching up? Never! On the contrary, we are establishing the law on a firm basis, as a law of faith and not of works.”

ROMANS iv. 25.

Some have found a difficulty in the twofold use of *διὰ* in this passage, the obvious meaning of which is, “who was delivered up on account of our (past) transgressions, and raised on account of (*i. e.*, for the purpose of) our (future) justification,” and have wished passages to be brought forward in which *διὰ* has this reference to the future. In Thucydides, iv., 40, a Greek islander is represented as asking one of the Lacedæmonians taken at Sphacteria an impertinent question, *δι’ ἀχθήδονα*, “for the purpose of annoying him.” In the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus, 698, we have *δι’ ἔριν αἱματοέσσαν*, where the sense is clearly “for the purpose of bloody strife.” Thucydides again, iv., 102, has *διὰ τὸ περιέχειν αὐτήν*, “for the purpose of enclosing it;” and v., 53, *διὰ τοῦ θύματος τὴν ἔσπραξιν*, “for the purpose of the exaction of the sacrifice.” Winer strangely denies the existence of this signification of *διὰ* altogether; but the above passages appear amply sufficient to establish it. Jelf acknowledges it, but cites no passage to confirm it.

If a question be raised as to the connection of our Lord’s resurrection with our justification, it is easily answered by re-

ference to John xvi. 8—11, where our Lord says that the spirit would convict the world respecting righteousness, *περὶ δικαιοσύνης*, because he was going to the Father. Now if our Lord's *δικαιοσύνη* depended for its proof upon his "going to the Father," it must have depended upon his resurrection as necessarily antecedent to his ascension. Our *δικαίωσις* or acceptance and treatment as *δίκαιοι* will be admitted by all to be dependent upon our Lord's *δικαιοσύνη*, and to have been the final cause for which he went through his human life and sufferings. Therefore it must have depended upon his resurrection, and have been one of the final causes of his resurrection. Therefore it is properly said by St. Paul, that "he rose for the purpose of our justification."

ROMANS vii. 1—4.

Most commentators have found a confusion in the argument of this passage, which certainly requires explanation. We cannot believe that St. Paul introduced this confusion for the mere purpose of sparing the feelings of the Jews, and avoiding the statement that the law was dead, which he is supposed to make according to the wrong reading, *ἀποθανόντος*, in ver. 6. Neither do we think, as Alford appears to do, that the phenomena are sufficiently accounted for by saying that "so far from this being an oversight or an inaccuracy, it is no more than that to which, more or less, all comparisons are liable; and no more can be required of them than that they should fit in the kernel and intent of the similitude." We will state the case in the words of Dean Alford, and then proceed to offer our own explanation of the causes which led or compelled St. Paul to make use of an illustration so partially applicable to the question. "The apostle is insisting on the fact, that DEATH DISSOLVES LEGAL OBLIGATION; but he is not drawing an exact parallel between the persons in his example and the persons in his application. The comparison might be thus made in terms common to both; (1.) *Death has dissolved the legal obligation between man and wife; therefore the wife is at liberty to be married to another.* (2.) *Death has dissolved the legal obligation between the law and us; therefore we are at liberty to be married to another.* So far the comparison is strict. Farther it will not hold: for in the example the liberated person is the *survivor* in the thing" (or rather case) "treated [of], the liberated person is the *dead person*," or rather the person who has died.

The fact appears to us to be this. An illustration is required for the argument in a case which may be represented by the sequence of letters *A B C*. An exact illustration would be re-

presented by the letters *a b c*, but such an illustration, from impossibilities in the nature of things, cannot be found in practical life. The case and argument must therefore either go without illustration, or must be illustrated by a case in which the circumstances are different, although the principle is the same. Instead therefore of a case that may be properly represented by *a b c*, or rather *a B c*, as the principle or major premiss, which occupies the second place in the Apostle's argument, is required to be identical, a case *d B e* is taken, which is the nearest approximation to a parallel case that practical life affords. Thus recourse is had to an imperfect illustration from the simple impossibility of obtaining a perfect one, and this, we apprehend, is the true account of the matter.

In the case under discussion St. Paul's argument is :—

A (minor premiss), "We have suffered (a symbolical) death in relation to the law."

B (major premiss), "Death dissolves legal obligation."

C (conclusion), "Therefore we are free from the obligations of the law."

In the illustration :—

d (minor premiss), "A wife is bound to her husband by the law."

B (major premiss), "Death dissolves legal obligation."

e (conclusion), "Therefore after her husband's death she is free from the obligations of the law as regards him."

B, the principle, is thus fully illustrated, and all that is required besides is the admission of the completeness and effectual nature of the death suffered in the formal transition from the state of a Jew to that of a Christian. This is here assumed as having been sufficiently explained before in Rom. vi. 2—7.

ROMANS xi. 13.

The reading *μὲν οὖν* in this verse is surely not the inert phrase which it is made out to be, not only by those commentators who reject, but even by those who defend it. Why can it not have its classical sense "nay, rather," although St. Paul elsewhere (with perhaps the exception of 1 Cor. vi. 4, *βιωτικά μὲν οὖν κριτήρια εἰν ἔχῃτε*) appears to employ the later expression *μενούργε*? Professor Jowett gives it this sense, but does not direct attention in his notes, as he certainly ought to have done, to so unusual an expression. Alford takes the *μὲν* and *οὖν* separately=therefore. But what additional spirit is put into the passage by taking *μὲν οὖν* in the sense "nay, rather," will be evident at once, if the whole passage (ver. 11—15) be

translated with a little more freedom from the trammels of the Authorized Version, than Professor Jowett has allowed himself. We shall also adopt the reading δὲ for γὰρ which is found in the three earliest MSS. in ver. 13, ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοὺς ἔθνεσιν. "I say, then: is it that they stumbled in order that they might fall? Never! but [that] by their lapse salvation [might be] to the Gentiles so as to provoke them to emulation. But if their lapse is the world's wealth and their degradation the Gentile's wealth, how much more their consummation? (Now I am speaking to you, Gentiles; NAY, RATHER, inasmuch as I am the Gentiles' apostle, I am glorifying my office, if anyhow I shall provoke my flesh [and blood] to emulation, and save some of them.) For if their rejection [is] the world's reconciliation, what [will] their acceptance [be], but life from the dead?"

EPHESIANS V. 15.

An exact illustration of the use of πῶς ἀκριβῶς = πῶς ἀκριβείᾳ, in this passage exists in the Greek preface to the oration of Æschines against Ctesiphon, line 73, ὅρα δὲ πῶς ἐπιλογικῶς ἤρξατο: "but see in how perorational a manner he begins." If any doubt remains in the minds of any of our readers as to the proper construction of πῶς ἀκριβῶς, we think that this quotation cannot fail to remove it.

The "Holy Places."—Our readers will be as much surprised to hear as we were to see, upon going to the terraced housetop early after our arrival, that there was a great gap in the dome of the church of the Holy Sepulchre. Many square yards of lead were wanting; the timbers were visible; and, whenever it rained, the water must have sapped the walls, and poured into the building itself; and yet there were dwelling in Jerusalem dignitaries of all the churches, who were squabbling, writing, and almost cursing one another, in order to obtain a footing in this self-same building, which they naturally consider the most sacred of any. We asked for an explanation, and were told in reply that France wished to repair it; Russia wished to repair it; England was, of course, indifferent; but the Sultan was anxious to have a finger in the pie, and the Christian Powers were unwilling that the infidel should participate, and thus have a further lien upon the sacred edifice; so between the three it was allowed to fall into a state of dilapidation which, if it occurred in a public building in England, would excite the interference of that despotic power, the police, under the Building Act.—*Builder.*

PROTESTANTISM IN SCANDINAVIA.*

[THE article which follows is the production of a scholar residing in Sweden, who is a member of the Roman Communion. We do not profess to be in these pages the special pleaders for any particular class of opinions, but rather to afford an arena for the free discussion of all appropriate topics. The editor is not bound by the opinions of his collaborateurs, and his collaborateurs are not bound by his opinions: mutual liberty is conceded, and so long as writers do not exceed the limits which the editor alone determines, they are not interfered with. He must be a very inattentive reader of this Journal, who thinks the editor can possibly be responsible for all the views which are advocated in it; but, at the same time, the concession of full personal liberty is understood to be limited by a preponderance of what may be fairly described as "*quod semper, quod ubique, et quod ab omnibus.*"

We have acceded to a request to print this Scando-Romanist essay, and we have made no objection. So far from objecting, we are glad to have an opportunity of shewing how unconscious prejudice crops out of even well-informed men, and how complacently they may point out the mote in their brother's eye, and overlook the beam in their own. Far be it from us to

* 1. *Anmärkingar om Helfvetesläran, Vara Theologer och Prester allvarligen att förehålla.* ("Remarks on the Doctrine of Hell for the serious consideration of our Theologians and Priests.") By C. J. Boström, Professor of Moral and Polit. Philosophy in Upsala University. Second improved Edition. 8vo, pp. 30. Upsala: 1864.

2. *Om den Eviga Osälgigheten. Granskning af "Anmärkingar om Helfvetesläran m. m."* ("On Everlasting Perdition, an Examination of Remarks on the Doctrine of Hell," etc.) By the Rev. A. F. Beckman, S.T.D., Dean of Upsala, and Prof. of Dogm. Theol. 8vo, pp. 41. Upsala: 1864.

3. *Ett filosofiskt eller ofilosofiskt Afventyr. Af Simplicius Quaerens.* ("A philosophical or unphilosophical adventure. By Simplicius Quaerens.") 8vo, pp. 16. Upsala: 1864.

4. *Nagra Tankar Författaren till Anmärkingar om Helfvetesläran m. m. allvarligen men vänligen att förehålla.* ("Some Thoughts seriously but friendly addressed to the Author of 'Remarks on the Doctrine of Hell,' etc.") 8vo, pp. 32. Stockholm: 1864.

5. *C. J. Boström och hans Filosofi.* Aftryck ur Svenskt Biografiskt Lexikon. ("C. J. Boström and his Philosophy. Reprinted from the Swedish Biographical Dictionary.") By C. J. Boström, Professor of Moral and Polit. Philos. in the Univ. of Upsala. 8vo, pp. 36. Örebro: 1859.

6. *Grundlinier till Filosofiska Statsläran.* ("Outlines of a Philosophical Theory of Government.") By C. J. Boström, Professor, etc. 8vo, pp. 104. Upsala: 1859.

7. *Om Förhållandet mellan Teologi och Filosofi i allmänhet och om den Boströmska Filosofien i synnerhet.* ("On the Relation between Theology and Philosophy in general, and on the Boströmist Philosophy in particular.") By the Rev. O. F. Myrberg, Junior Professor of Theology. 8vo, pp. 58. Upsala: 1861.

come or wish to come into collision with our contributors; but it would be unfair to others and dishonest in ourselves to suffer the introduction, and sundry special sentences and epithets in the ensuing paper, to go forth without a remark. What we have to say will be less a refutation of charges made against Protestantism in the gross, than a rejoinder partly in the *et tu Brute!* style, and partly in vindication of some things alleged against us. Among the items which are condemned are some which we also condemn, others which are in principle allowed by the Roman Church, and others which we should never surrender.

We shall chiefly be occupied with the first paragraph, which is meant for a sort of natural history of Protestantism; but which is one-sided, and a grievous misrepresentation. Assuming the rejection of the universal authority of the Roman see to be the first step, it is assumed that all succeeding steps lead down to mere naturalism, and the rejection of all divine teaching. Now "the authority of the Holy See" is denied by most of the Christian communities of Asia, Africa, and Eastern Europe; and have they descended to the miserable condition described by this Scando-Romanist? They have descended, we admit, but it is in precisely the same way as the Roman Catholics have descended, wherever they are unchecked by the Protestant spirit—into abject superstition, a mechanical religion, and spiritual torpor. That individuals among Protestants have adopted most of the errors our essayist mentions is true; but it is either folly or ignorance to suppose them characteristic of Protestantism. It is no less true that the same errors have crept in and been adopted, and are now held by myriads in Italy, France, and elsewhere, among the Roman Catholics:—what would be thought if we said the natural tendency and end of their system is sheer infidelity, if not atheism? We know that in England, in France, in Italy, and elsewhere, those who are avowed and most furious infidels and atheists are in a very large measure apostates from Romanism. The notorious scepticism and unbelief which attained such gigantic proportions in France during the last century can hardly be referred to as a result of Protestantism, for Protestantism, then, put a man beyond the pale of humanity; at any rate it involved an absolute loss of all civil rights, and in the case of preachers, death without mercy was its reward.

We have heretics of all kinds in England, and sects of heretics; but are these peculiar to Protestantism? Did not heresies and sects exist in the days of the apostles? did not Justin, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, and a host of early fathers, write about these heresies and sects? were not successive

councils called to consider and condemn these heresies? and are any of the opinions enumerated below as heretical worse than many which sprang up in the primitive Church,—are they even different as a whole? More than this, are all the points indicated below really erroneous? Assuredly not. The authority of the Roman See was denied with impunity, and on principle, by men whom Rome itself now invokes as saints. The civil magistrates have for fifteen centuries and a half been invested with authority in the Church: but it is simply not true that it is characteristic of Protestantism to confer the *spiritual* authority of the Church upon the civil magistrate. Nor is it a characteristic of Protestantism to reject rites and doctrines which are not prominent in Scripture: the contrary is the *fact*—it gives prominence to the minor and less obvious teachings of the Word of God, while it is Rome which finds it convenient to ignore them, with a few notable exceptions. The right of private interpretation of the Bible we concede, but not as misrepresented: it is a right which belongs to man as man: and no civil power, nor any other power on earth, can abrogate the right: but he who is bound by God's law to read the Bible is also bound to obey it—not to put a meaning upon it, but to receive its teachings: for the proper use of the Bible, man is responsible to God, and not to man, and this is what we mean by private interpretation. We do not mean that a man must not, but that he must seek God's Spirit to help him to use his Bible rightly, and that he must avail himself of all the assistance which human learning can afford. He would be desperate who said that Protestants have not contributed more than all others to the elucidation of all matters of Biblical criticism and illustration. The Romanist's is a creed of mental idleness in this respect,—it expects all the mysteries of the written Word of God to be laid open by the magic wand of authority. His present holiness the Pope has thrown himself, Curtius-like, into the gulf, and will gain no honour for his rashness: in the famous Encyclical, dated Dec. 8th, 1864, the following marvellous sentence appears among the principal errors of our age, which Pope Pius condemns:—"Methodus et principia, quibus antiqui Doctores Scholastici Theologiam excoluerunt, temporum nostrorum necessitatibus scientiarumque progressui minime congruunt." Thus rendered by Mr. Walker:—"The method and principles by which the old scholastic doctors cultivated theology are no longer suitable to the demands of the age and the progress of science."

If, as many teach, the Pope's official and dogmatic utterances are the inspired and infallible Word of God, the methods and principles of the schoolmen are suitable to the wants of our

times and the progress of science. This may be true at Rome, in the cloister, and in the confessional, but it is not true in any proper sense. It is all very well to ask us to go back to the old schoolmen, but if we do, we shall tell Rome that they were the fathers of rationalism, and the fathers of a great deal of other mischief. We can understand that men who learned so much from Aristotle should be set up as models for us, because Pallavicini (who was a Cardinal by the way) declared,—“*Senza Aristotele noi mancavamo di molti articoli di fede*,”—“We should have wanted many articles of faith without Aristotle.” Perhaps, by the way, our Swedish essayist can tell us whether the schoolmen are all accounted holy and orthodox? For our part we think the learned Sadeel was not far wrong in saying, “*Scholasticos illos, ob Philosophiæ cum theologia confusionem, dicendos potius philosophos quam theologos.*” Sadeel was a Protestant, but would he have said more than is said in what follows from the pen of a Roman Catholic?

“Before I speak of Abailard, whose name is essentially connected with letters, I must observe, that the new method of philosophising in religion to which I allude had grown out of the more sober rules which were established by the great masters of the Bea school in their theological lectures. It was the dialectic art, rendered complicated and mysterious by metaphysical terms and subtleties, applied, as a test of truth, to every subject, and particularly to those of religion. But it is evident that religion could not be benefited by such an auxiliary; and what service was it likely to render to philosophy? The object of these doctors was not so much to elucidate truth or to promote its interests, as to perplex by abstruse and elaborate distinctions; and on every question to evince an imperturbable obstinacy. No attention was paid to the realities of nature nor to the operations of the human mind; but the wildest fictions and the most palpable sophisms were embodied in a nomenclature of distinctions, which seemed calculated for the defence of error rather than the support of truth. It had, however, a powerful tendency to exercise the faculties of the mind, the extraordinary display of which often attracted admiration, particularly of numbers who flocked to the schools, and crowned the triumphs of the masters with their applause. The feats of the Grecian sophists, which had been exhibited in Rome and in Athens, were repeated in the twelfth century on the benches of our Christian schools, and with the nearly similar effect of engendering difficulties, of multiplying errors, and of obscuring truth. To the solution of theological questions the philosophy of Aristotle had, before this time, been applied, imperfect translations of certain portions of which were in the hands of the western teachers. It now came into much more general vogue, and acquired higher estimation. Some men of curious inquiry resorted to the Arabian schools, particularly those of Spain, in which, having learned the language, or at least understood in what esteem the writings of the Athenian sage were held by them, they brought back other translations, which were, it is said, less faithful

than those already in their possession. Even their intricacy conferred a value which the difficulty of their procurement would serve to enhance. From this time the peripatetic philosophy gradually obtained the ascendancy in the schools, which it maintained through a succession of many years. Its progress indeed was occasionally checked by men of sober discernment, who beheld the fatal use to which its perverted precepts were applied."^b

Such was scholasticism !

Another alleged feature of Protestantism is its rejection from the Bible of such books as it may be inconvenient to let remain in it. This is puerile if it refers to the Apocryphal books ; and in the face of Jerome's words, "*Non sunt in canone*," is almost an insult. Who put these books into the canon ? We see they were not there in Jerome's time, and we are not aware that any general council fixed them there until that of Trent, which it is absurd to call a general council, although fashionable and convenient to do so.

The next feature of Protestantism "is the rejection of all sacraments." Indeed ! This is certainly information ! The simple fact is, that the rejection of all sacraments is one of the least known principles avowed under the name of Christianity. The Church of England has not rejected all sacraments, as it has not "rejected" the Apocrypha ; but it has formally reaffirmed the practices and principles of the early Church. In the sight of God there may be as much guilt in perverting sacraments, and in multiplying them, as in repudiating them. Be this as it may, Protestants do repudiate, *as sacraments*, five of the so-called sacraments of the Roman Church, and repudiate many of the technical and ceremonial accompaniments of Baptism and the Eucharist in the Roman Church. We repudiate transubstantiation and the mass, but we retain the Lord's Supper ; and we repudiate a number of things which disguise the simplicity of baptism as a doctrine and as a rite, but we retain the baptism of Scripture.

As for the other so-called states in the career of Protestantism, we say what is equally applicable to some of those which precede,—they only characterize individuals and coteries ; are, in fact, no more peculiar to Protestant than to Roman Catholic countries, and need no reply.

In his second paragraph our Northern essayist illustrates his imaginary history by what he pleases to exhibit as the example supplied by England. It would not require much labour to shew that his notions of English Protestant history are absurd ;

^b *Literary History of Middle Ages*. By J. Berington. (Edition Bogue, 1846).

and his inferences illogical. Setting out with the intention of shewing what the *Church* is, he shews what the *State* has done; as if forsooth the state involved and determined the Church. *Henry* rejected the Pope; *Edward* cast away five sacraments; *Elizabeth* broke off apostolical succession, etc. But neither Henry, Edward, nor Elizabeth, was the Protestant Church; and besides, we read history in a somewhat different way. The facts adduced to shew that Baptism and the Eucharist are rejected by the English Church prove nothing of the kind; and what the English Church really believes on the subject may be found in the Catechism for Children in the Prayer Book, and therefore need not be repeated here. If our Scando-Romanist means only that great liberty is allowed, *practically*, in the Church of England, we not only agree with him, but prove it by *the toleration of almost all that is ROMISH in rites, dress, and doctrines*:—not much like the imaginary tendencies and history of Protestantism as set forth by our author! We must again insist, however, that all the rationalistic and sceptical opinions of which Protestantism in general, and the English Church in particular, is accused, obtain in no less a proportion among the enlightened populations of Roman Catholic countries.

With respect to the remainder of the article, we disavow all complicity with the author in either his opinions or his language. We have readers upon the continent of Europe who will be able to deal with his facts, if they are not fairly represented. This, therefore, is a point upon which we shall not dwell; especially as we have something which we are more anxious to say:

“Protestantism leads to rationalism.” This is almost an axiom with modern Romanists; but it is equally true that “Romanism leads to rationalism.” In the French idiom, “there is a rationalism and a rationalism;” in other words, “rationalism” is a vague term, like “eating” and “drinking,” and by no means implies what must be wrong. We should define true rationalism as Dr. Watts defined logic; it is “the right use of reason;” and there is the same difference between true and false rationalism as there is between logic and sophistry. True rationalism is the glory as well as the duty of man,—a law of his nature as well as a doctrine of the Bible: and all indiscriminate raving against it is foolish. If Protestantism leads to true rationalism—the right use of reason—there is a presumption that it comes near to God’s intention as to what religion should be. Surely such rationalism is better than the bondage of the soul and the stagnation of intellect. Surely God never meant that the laity should be a sort of puppets or marionettes, which shall move, speak, feel, think and believe exactly as authority—autho-

riety exercised by *men*—dictates. Far be such impious thoughts from us! The worship of a free soul may be clear and cold compared with the dramatic passionateness and effervescence of emotion which appear in the devotion of many, especially ladies, from Paris and Rome to Madrid and St. Jago; but who will say that the calm, self-conscious, intelligent, and simple adoration of such a rationalist as makes the Bible his rule and law, is not infinitely better than the multitude of punctilios, which only appeal to the senses, which few devotees understand, and which commonly excite the emotions without mending the heart and life?

Protestantism tends to rationalism in the same sense in which the Bible tends to it, whether rationalism be the use of reason, that which is reasonable, or that for which one is or ought to be able to give a reason. In this sense Protestantism is rational and Scriptural, and what is opposed to it is irrational and unscriptural. Protestantism “denies the authority of the Holy See;” and this we also think to be rational in an important sense. But the expression is a shadow of generality; and we ask, Does it mean the authority which the Pope of Rome actually has, or that which he claims, or that which he ought to have? Does it mean his authority in his own See, or all over the world? Does it mean his authority in spiritual, or in civil and other affairs? We think Protestantism would be very irrational indeed if it did not scorn many forms of authority which have been and are claimed for the Pope. If by doing this Protestantism tends to rationalism, we wish it God speed.

Protestantism tends to rationalism again, by rejecting “doctrines and practices of the Church, which stand less prominently forward in the sacred writings.” The Church here of course means our Author’s Church, but we are at a loss to know what “doctrines and practices” he means, unless it be those which are only extorted from Scripture by a non-natural and uncritical process: these Protestantism rejects. Purgatory and prayers to the dead, transubstantiation, indulgences, the extravagant worship of the Virgin Mary, and many other doctrines and practices, may be alluded to; and if it be rationalism to reject these, would that all men were rationalists!

A recent dispatch of Mr. Odo Russell, sent from Rome to our Government, may be referred to as indicative of the very exalted and liberal views and practices which are there supposed to be right and proper, but which we believe to be signs of an incurable apostacy. Here is the document we have in mind, and which no dignitary of the Romish Church has contradicted, or officially corrected:—

“Extract of a despatch addressed by Mr. Odo Russell to the Earl of Clarendon, dated Rome, Feb. 8, 1866 :—‘Travellers visiting the Pope’s dominions should be very careful not to bring forbidden books or Colt’s revolvers with them, the Custom-house officers having strict orders to confiscate them, and it is not always possible to recover them after the owners have left the Roman states. Forbidden books are those condemned by the Congregation of the Index,—books on religion or morality in general, political and philosophical works of every description, and more especially Italian religious tracts published in London. But, above all, travellers should be careful not to bring English, Italian, or other Bibles with them, —the Bible being strictly prohibited.’”

Protestant rationalists naturally take with them revolvers and Bibles! *Revolvers*, prohibited in a den of brigands and assassins! and *Bibles*, prohibited by the vicar of Jesus Christ! Can rationalism go further than this? It certainly cannot do worse.

Better that where many think, some should think wrong, than that none should think at all. But if rationalism means private judgment, there is any amount of that permitted in the Church of Rome. “Pious opinions and practices” which are not *de fide* may be counted by hundreds in the Roman Communion, and what are these but the result of private judgment? Still, so long as they favour the assumptions and superstitions of Popery they are encouraged, and, for aught we know, some of them may be, as some have been, elevated to the rank of essentials to salvation. When Rome tells the world what her creed is, and condemns a host of known impostures, errors, and abuses, which she now winks at everywhere, we will begin to listen to her, and to think she has some right to admonish and rebuke the rest of the Christian world. In the meantime arrogant assumption and general denunciation come with an ill grace from her.

In conclusion: we believe it would be difficult to find any rationalistic Protestant writers who have avowed sentiments more directly opposed to the Christianity of Christ and his apostles, than the present Pope Pius IX. has avowed in promulgating the doctrine of the *immaculate conception*; and we think few books more like the paganising of our religion than the *Glories of Mary*, the *Power of Mary*, and the *Magnificences of Mary*,—the first and second of which are by one who is now canonized and prayed to as a saint in heaven! Rationalism rather than such profanities!—ED. J. S. L.]

The course of Protestantism is in most cases pretty much the same. It begins by denying the authority of the Holy See,

and investing the civil magistrate with the spiritual authority of the Church. It then proceeds to reject those doctrines and practices of the Church which stand less prominently forward in the sacred writings, and intrenches itself behind Scripture, and Scripture alone, "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," as understood and interpreted by each individual for himself; having however first taken care to remove from its "whole" Bible such books as it may not be convenient to let remain there. The next step is the rejection of all sacraments, which is soon followed by the ungodding of our Blessed Saviour, after which the various doctrines are cast away, one after the other, till at last nothing whatever of the Christian faith is left, and the unfortunate apostates have at last no other guide than the depraved opinionatedness that they call their "reason," and of which they make an all-exacting idol, to conduct them, each by a different road, to that broad way of pride that leadeth to destruction.

Such is the course that we see the heresy of the sixteenth century is now nearly completing in England. Henry VIII. rejected the authority of the Holy See. His successor, Edward VI. (or rather, that poor boy's guardians), cast away five of the sacraments. Elizabeth broke off the apostolical succession of the hierarchy, or, in other words, abolished the priesthood, and substituted a mock hierarchy and a mock priesthood of Erastian slaves. When, in Charles the Second's time, the concluding rubric was added to the Communion Service of the English Church, the doctrine of the Eucharist was finally and authoritatively abolished; and this was not long ago followed by the doctrine of Baptism, which the decision in the Gorham case handed over to the owls and to the bats. Thus all the sacraments were disposed of. Still more lately it has been decided by Her Majesty in Council, that the damnation of the wicked and the existence of Satan are but fables,—a decision doubtless very consolatory to the last-mentioned class,—and that the divine inspiration of the Scriptures is to be classed among the "fond things vainly invented." This is at once taking away the mask from hypocrisy, at once proclaiming infidelity,—this is at once declaring that the cuckoo-cry of "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," under which the law-established sect has for centuries been ravaging the land, pouring out the blood and confiscating the property of its opponents, is but a hypocritical lie, a pious fraud, a pretext for plundering the Church and murdering her children, and at the same time a screen to hide the foul features of infidelity. For of course with the inspiration and consequent authority of Scripture (tra-

dition having already been got rid of), all dogma must necessarily be considered as abolished, and each individual is left to the guidance of his own erring reason, and is in short reduced to the condition of a heathen. This is of course the natural result, a result foreseen and aimed at by many of the more far-sighted infidel Reformers, of giving a written law without a living judge to administer and interpret it; for, as Socrates observes, "a written document is like a picture. A picture indeed represents its objects as living, but, if you ask it a question, it preserves a dignified silence. It is the same with (written) language: you may indeed think that it speaks rationally, but if, desiring more accurate information of what it utters, you put a question, it has ever but one and the same indication to give: and a work once written circulates equally among those who understand it and those for whom it is altogether unfit, and cannot know to whom it ought to speak and to whom not. When used improperly and unjustly it requires the aid of its father, for it is unable to defend itself." A similar experience is indicated by the rabbinical phrase,^c "Learn from the mouth of the scribes, not from the books." In Switzerland and Northern Germany, where not even the external form of an apostolic hierarchy was preserved, the downward course was still more rapid, the natural and logical development of Protestantism took place more swiftly, and the so-called "philosophers" now rule uncontrolled in the chairs of Luther and Zwingli, and have indeed succeeded in eradicating almost every particle of Christian faith from the minds and consciences of the people. In Sweden, although the savage bloodthirsty tyrant and usurper, Charles IX., who completed the Reformation, succeeded in making his will law, yet he preserved the external form of the Church's government by Bishops, each assisted by his Chapter, though the Bishop's power was reduced almost to nothing; and some maintain that even the Apostolical Succession was preserved,^d though this opinion appears to rest upon very unsatisfactory grounds. In consequence of this, the fragments of Christianity, which constituted Swedish Lutheran orthodoxy, were much longer preserved in that country than in Germany,

^c למדו מפי סופרים ולא מפי ספרים. As we quote from memory, we are not able to say from which rabbinical work the phrase is taken, but this is of no consequence.

^d Peter Manson's consecration at Rome, through which the succession is said to have been preserved, to say nothing of its being an event unknown at Rome, labours under chronological difficulties, which, to say the least, render it in the highest degree improbable. See De Warrimont. *De la Prétendue Succession Apostolique en Suède*. [Mr. Stubbs, the last English editor of Mosheim, refers in refutation of De Warrimont to the *Col. Ch. Chron.* for 1861.—Ed. J. S. L.]

and indeed the proportion of the clergy and people that still hold the principal doctrines of the Catholic faith, that is to say, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, as well as the divine inspiration of the Scriptures (or at least those parts of the Scriptures that compose the ordinary Protestant Bible), is still very considerable. The proportion is however, it is much to be feared, continually decreasing, whereas the influence of the so-called philosophy of Germany continually increases. The main feature of this system is conceit, a furious opposition to everything like faith. Its method of proceeding is well chosen; whereas the Christian doctrine requires at its very commencement humility and the sacrifice of self, this system begins by an appeal to man's intellectual pride, rejects all Christian humility as dishonouring human nature, and all authority as a violation of intellectual freedom. In short, it summarily denies all revealed religion, builds upon pride, teaches each individual to deify himself, and, though the "pure reason" of a hundred different philosophers give a hundred different and, in many cases, diametrically opposite conclusions, declares every man's unaided reason to be an infallible and all-sufficient guide in matters relative both to this world and the next.

Our readers are in all probability aware, that the Augsburg Confession is, as regards most of the main doctrines of Christianity, perfectly orthodox; that is to say, that although the latter part of it contains much that is false and denies much that is true and of faith, yet that the most prominent doctrines of the faith, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the efficacy of the Sacraments (at least those of Baptism and the holy Eucharist), etc., in the first part of it, are orthodoxly and catholicly set forth, and in terms not to be misunderstood. With a view to insure orthodoxy within the kingdom, every ordinary professor in the universities and every higher school teacher (*lector*) is required to subscribe and on oath declare his conscientious adherence to this confession, as set forth in the "Symbolical Books" at the Synod of Upsala in 1593. As, until the last few years, a breach of this oath in his public teaching would have subjected a clergyman or professor to deprivation and deposition, this regulation enabled the authorities to preserve at least the outward appearance of Lutheran orthodoxy; but in later times modern liberalism seems to find it unreasonable that a man should be punished even for the basest deception and perjury.

Οὐκ ἀνδρὸς ὄρκοι πίστις, ἀλλ' ὄρκων ἀνήρ,

says Æschylus, and accordingly the "philosophers" have not

been slow in taking advantage of this "liberal" disposition of the public mind. A pious fraud, according to their ethical system, can be no sin, at least if it be profitable.

Ἀπάτης δικαίως οὐκ ἀποστατεῖ θεός.

says the same great poet. They accordingly make no difficulty now of swearing their faith in the Augsburg Confession, to get possession of the clerical benefices and professional chairs and salaries, and then proceeding to attack openly every part of the Christian religion. Several priests and teachers in various parts of the kingdom have put forward works in opposition to the doctrines contained in the Augsburg Confession, and yet pretend a right to break their oaths and keep their benefices; and the public, led by the clamour of the liberal newspapers, so far countenance the fraud, that the Consistories have found it impossible to execute the law against the offenders.

The mischief, however, has been going on less openly for a long time. In each of the universities there are two professors and a junior professor of philosophy, and in every high school a teacher of it, and it is one of the compulsory subjects in which a student is obliged to take examination. The science, if we may credit its advocates, is *κατ' ἐξοχὴν scientia scientiarum*, embracing and within itself including all knowledge, human and divine,* and if such really be its propædæutic, the person competent to begin the study of philosophy might be sent to Mr. Barnum to be shewn as a curiosity; but of this quackery we shall only remark, that such pretension is, to a person possessing common sense, sufficient to shew what this philosophy really is, —not the integral plentitude of, but the empty surrogate for all science, not the solemn, peaceful, and sublime perfection of knowledge, but the worthless glitter and noisy babble of shameless impudence and conceited chattering ignorance.

The author of the first, fifth, and sixth pamphlets in the list of works mentioned at the head of this article, became Professor of Moral and Political Philosophy at Upsala in 1842, but has officiated in that capacity ever since 1840, when his predecessor, becoming a member of his Majesty's Cabinet, could no longer reside at the university. He had then already for three years holden the office of junior professor (adjunct), and has lately become Emeritus; and he has of course, like other older

* The reader must not suppose this pretentious absurdity to be the same as what Aristotle says about the *τέλος* of philosophy in the middle of the first chapter of the *Nicom. Ethics*. But one has only to read with ordinary attention the words of Aristotle to see the vast difference.

† This oath is not now required directly, but is implied in the oath on the Constitution.

ordinary professors, sworn his faith in the Augsburg Confession. He has accordingly had nearly thirty years to infect the university with his poisonous system, and he has diligently used them, for there is scarcely a single philosophy-teacher's place in the country which is not in the possession of his followers. The Boström-philosophy is in fact that which in Sweden is generally accepted. Dr. Boström having, on the usual condition of acceptance of the Augsburg Confession, obtained his preferments, entered on his professional duties; and he went to work warily. He sheltered his system from criticism by strictly abstaining from publishing it. The only way to become acquainted with it was to attend his lectures, for understanding which, however, it was naturally necessary (for a professor, of course, cannot begin from the first principles of his system in every course) to obtain rudimentary instruction from one of his "Docents," and to take down in writing what one heard. The MSS. which students thus made could occasionally be bought, but of course were rarer and dearer than a printed book would have been, and their value was naturally greater or less according to the writer's power of remembering and setting forth the master's sentiments. It requires, no doubt, a high degree of compendious genius to set forth the whole amount of human knowledge, the sum total of science, on a couple of quires of foolscap. We see here, however, the formation of a complete esoteric school, in which the poison was stealthily and warily instilled. Now, bearing in mind that this philosophy is a compulsory subject which a candidate for a university-degree is obliged to study, and even previously, in order to be received as a student, must be examined in, the effect of a mysterious and esoteric system, which appeals directly to a youth's intellectual pride, and by flattering his vanity, encourages him to deny his faith, on the susceptible, generous and trusting mind of a young man entering the university, fresh from the gymnasium (public school), and earnestly seeking after knowledge, but destitute of the experience necessary to distinguish between arrogant pretension and real superiority, can easily be conceived. The mischief done is indeed incalculable, for this insidious and demoralizing method of disseminating the doctrine was strictly persevered in till 1859, when the little brochure which stands sixth on our list was published as an article in the *Biographical Lexicon*, and, though small and incomplete, yet suffices to give some idea of the system. By exposing young men and boys to the artifices of the teachers of a science which ought, even when properly taught, as Aristotle observes, to be reserved for the study of riper years, the havoc that has been made in the faith of the

present and the rising generation is truly lamentable, and, as almost every gymnasium (high school for boys) in the kingdom is now provided with a teacher of the same heresy, it is impossible to say where the mischief will end. Dr. Boström has enjoyed in his own country a reputation almost, if not quite, equal to that of Hegel in Germany, and his philosophy was for a time cried up as far less anti-christian than Hegelianism (more anti-christian it could not well be); but it is time to look into the little book above mentioned, and see how far it justifies the preference, whether one Abbot of Unreason has any advantage over the other.

The Deity, according to Dr. Boström, is a being without will, without cognisance, and totally inactive, occupied from all eternity to all eternity in contemplating, in perfect rest and with selfish enjoyment, his own perfections: in short, very much like an oyster in his shell, lying quite still, and capable only of enjoyment.

"To finite beings God bears the general relation that he constitutes their ground—immediately as regards the purely spiritual and ideal in them, but thereby also mediately as regards the more or less material and real. In his nature, indeed, he stands in no kind of relation and exercises no kind of activity; but this does not prevent the possibility of his doing so for finite beings, and his being in and for them considered as standing in relation to them," etc., etc. (p. 17).

Our author then, with as much self-complacency and self-importance as if he were all the seven wise men of Greece rolled into one, proceeds to criticise and amend the Christian religion, with which he tells us that his own abortion "in the main" agrees. Let us see the agreement.

"In the first place, Boström, as a philosopher, can discover no Trinity in the Deity; which ought not to surprise anybody, as he so rigorously separates from the being of God all that is finite and anthropathical. Finite rational beings may, indeed, have to each other the relation of higher and lower, but in relation to God they are all equally his from all eternity begotten children, as far as regards their spirit or idea. And if one will improperly designate by the word 'Son' the eternal idea or spirit, then we must say that the number of God's sons is infinite, and that there is no difference between them (p. 20). As to the Holy Ghost, it is nothing more than what Boström understands by religion."

So much for the Trinity and the Incarnation, we come now to the Atonement.

"But, moreover, Boström cannot, as a philosopher, know of or acknowledge any *satisfactio vicaria*, or any other *salvation* or *atonement* than that given by the Deity's general operation as the Holy Spirit or religion. As

regards the former, he maintains it to be a notion that has arisen out of a false conception of the significancy and object of punishment in a state with respect to which Boström's opinions differ considerably, not only from those ordinarily entertained by the many, but even from those of most criminalists both of ancient and modern times [a strong presumption, by the way, that they are wrong]; and, as for the latter, he considers the world's development to be nothing else than the continual salvation of, and atonement for, the beings of finite reason" (p. 24).

To finish this "agreement with Christianity in general," and with the Augsburg Confession in particular, we may add that B. acknowledges the existence of no such body as the Church, and though he admits the immortality of the human soul, he rejects summarily the doctrine of eternal perdition (p. 22), as also that of a creation, and, of course, of a revelation. He grants to people what he calls "unlimited freedom of conscience and religion;" but this unlimited freedom does not include freedom to disseminate (except in his own case) one's opinions, to change one's communion, or to hold conventicles (p. 23). The author, in short, has been always an advocate for the persecution of Dissenters; and this "unlimited freedom" seems to mean that a man may enjoy his own religion provided he keep it a secret, so as never to let others know of it who have the opportunity of persecuting him; that is to say, he will allow others just so much freedom as it is absolutely impossible to take away from them, and no more. His Church-polity is, in fact, the most unlimited Cæsaro-papism, more absolute than any that exists in Europe, or perhaps in the world.

Dr. Boström's philosophy is a system of absolute idealism; that is to say, it denies the existence of the material and bodily world, and assumes that the phenomena comprehended under that name are only imperfect perceptions of the spiritual, of which latter, in its turn, a one-sided aspect, taken from the point-of-view of bare perception and thought, is given.

Like other philosophers, Dr. Boström has a system of morals and a system of State policy. Of the former the little pamphlet before us gives some account, though we do not occupy ourselves with it. On the latter he has given out a separate treatise, No. 6 on our list, which is its author's favourite production. Of it we shall only remark that it is of the most rigorously conservative character, and is generally disapproved of even by those who in other respects are among the Professor's warmest admirers; though, for our own part, were we to criticise it, we should be inclined to view some at least of its conclusions far more favourably than his other works, irrespectively, however, of his way of coming at them.

Dr. Boström's philosophy and theology have been made the subject of a careful and well-written examination, and his anthropology, ethics, and politics more compendiously reviewed by Dr. Myrberg, one of the junior Professors of Theology at Upsala. Our space prevents us from giving any detailed account of this valuable little work, but we cannot help extracting a part of the refutation of Boström's conception of the Deity.

"The main feature in Boström's conception of the Godhead is the total absence of all *ethical* or *moral* attributes in God that characterises it. The *absolute reason*, or the *being of absolute perfection*, such is the favourite term that Boström on all occasions uses of God; and, if we look at Boström's arrangement of the divine attributes, which express the more accurate character of his idea of God, we find those only included which relate to the existence and knowledge of God, not to the divine will. The property of willing appears to a Boströmite philosopher, according to the blundering custom of philosophers in general, too simple and mean a quality to attribute to God. Accordingly, all such attributes as *holiness*, *justice*, *goodness*, *love*, etc.; in a word, all the moral attributes, have at one fell swoop been removed from the Supreme Being. Here the infinite difference between Boström's idea of God and the Christian doctrine is evident; for in Christianity it is just the ethical attributes, holiness, love, etc., that are most strongly emphasized, and that not in a mere accommodative sense, but in a manner that leaves it indubitable that God, in himself and without all regard to his creatures, unites all these properties in himself in their highest perfection. 'God is light, and in him is no darkness,' says St. John the Apostle, hereby representing God as the highest purity and perfection as regards knowledge; but he does not stop with that one side of God's being, but represents him also as the highest purity and perfection as regards will; as the *holy* and the just on the one side, as *love in truth and holiness* on the other. And, in the last definition, *Love in truth and holiness*, St. John's and the New Testament's idea of the Godhead reaches its culmination. An icy and chilling blast goes forth from the, in the strictest sense, heartless reason-god that the Boströmite philosophy would oppose to this; and small knowledge must he possess of man's religious wants who thinks that they can be satisfied by an idea of God that thus utterly ignores the weight and significance of the moral life. No wonder that in the being of such a god a relation of love, such as finds its expression in the Christian Trinity, is not to be thought of. . . . Such is, in short, the Boströmite conception of God. To Christian consciousness it is radically false and erroneous. To accept it would not be to make one or two additions to the Christian doctrine, but to embrace an altogether different and new religion; for religion in its entirety rests on the conception of God, and with the change or alteration of that, the entire religion is changed and altered" (p. 32).

We regret that we cannot extract more from Dr. Myrberg's sensible little book, wherein he has exposed the absurdities of a subtle and mischievous heresy, of which he justly remarks, in

the words of Cicero, that there is no folly so monstrous but that a philosopher can be found who will maintain it.

We are very far from wishing to intimate that the study of philosophy is in itself anything wrong, or, indeed, that it is other than good. The works of Aristotle and Plato have always been, still are, and probably always will be read by Christians with both pleasure and advantage, and, when properly studied, no doubt conduce to fixing a pious reader's faith in, and enhancing his thankfulness to, our blessed Saviour. The same may be said of the works of very many other philosophers (for the Fathers of the Church and schoolmen of the Christian period were all more or less philosophers) who have flourished in the various ages of the Church, from the beginning up to the present time. What we protest against is the self-conceited and mischievous modern school of Northern Germany, which is after all a mere *rifacciamento* of Spinoza's system, which system was itself a most perverse travesty of the Kabbala.

But Dr. Boström is an old man, and is determined to finish his career in a manner worthy of a full-bred mountebank. Accordingly, like "the genuine Mr. Merryman" of Bartlemy Fair's itinerant theatre, he finishes the comedy by the surprising feat of swallowing himself alive and whole. This feat he has accomplished in his last work, "Remarks on the Doctrine of Hell," to which we now turn our attention.

The event that has given rise to the paroxysm that has called forth this eccentric production is as follows. A wretched woman in the province of Dalecarlia, urged by a sick and somewhat insane daughter, has bound her child of nine years old, and has, with the help of an equally fanatic female neighbour, actually flogged it to death, in order, she says, to save its soul from the devil and hell. From this the Professor takes occasion to rise up, ferule in hand, and cast the whole responsibility of the appalling crime on the Church-clergy on the ground that they teach the existence of the devil and hell, and, in bullying and insolent language, lectures the theologians in their own province, of which he understands no more than the unborn babe. Let us hear his exordium.

"When will our thoughtless theologians and priests acquire sufficient sound reason and Christian illumination to banish entirely from religious teaching the old and unreasonable doctrine of the devil and hell, which has in all ages done so much mischief, and in our time is a veritable scandal? This doctrine is, however, nothing else than a coarse and superstitious production of the imagination, which originally belonged to the barbarous Persians,[†] and was received from them by the equally barbarous

[†] Persons less ignorant of Oriental antiquity than Dr. Boström will not

Jews, from whom it has descended to all the Christian barbarians, who preach it even to the present time. It has, however, no ground either in reason or experience; and, being an insult to the being and dignity of God, is as irreligious and unchristian as it is superstitious and unreasonable."

In a note we are asked whether it be possible to imagine a greater shame and disgrace to a priesthood pretending to the name of Christian than that the Scriptures of those *hard-hearted and vengeful Semites*, the Jews, who represent their God as visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation, should still be transmitted as God's Word? Another note informs us what Dr. Boström means by the word Christian, which he constantly and with such unblushing effrontery applies to his own dogmas.

"That the doctrine is found in the New Testament is no evidence of its being Christian, for the words *Biblical* and *Christian* are by no means synonymous. Christendom is, in fact, older than the Bible, and there is good reason to suppose a wide difference between Christ's own religious convictions and those of the Christian authors of the Scriptures, who were not even immediate disciples.^A Christ's own Christianity was his deep and pure consciousness of God; that is, his own deep and pure reason, for the two expressions are synonymous; and Christian truth is also accessible to us in our own reason, if we seriously seek it, instead of trying to obtain it from other sources. That it, in writings written a good time after Christ by Christian Jews and Greeks, should be found mixed up with Jewish and Greek notions, which cannot be acknowledged as Christian, inasmuch as they are evidently unreasonable, is so natural that, were it otherwise, it would be a miracle. Moreover, *if such notions are to be found in Christ himself (which we have no means of knowing), he held them as a man of his nation and age, not as the high founder of our religion, and accordingly they are to us, as Christians, destitute of all authority and importance.* For us truly Christian and truly rational are one and the same thing, and were so for Christ himself; *for man can have no other source of religious knowledge than his own reason*, for he is only a sensitive-rational being, and no such knowledge can possibly come to him through his senses."

We now understand the secret of the marvellous "agreement in the main" of Professor Boström's dogmas with Christianity. If Christianity be not the doctrine of the New Testament, which

require reminding that the doctrine of punishment after death is older than the Persian period. Moreover, the Jewish and Christian doctrine, which makes Hell eternal, cannot be taken from the Persian, for we learn from the Vendidad, the Yashts, and the Bundeshesh, that Ormuzd opens the abode of the Darvands five days every year to let out penitents, and that ultimately Ahriman and the Deevs will be converted to the law of Ormuzd and saved.

^A The author seems to allow himself a synecdoche, for St. Mark and St. Luke only among the writers of the New Testament were not immediate disciples.

was written by Jews and Greeks, who were not immediate disciples of our Lord, nor that of Christ himself, who was but "a man of his nation and age," i.e. "a hard-hearted and vengeful Semite," living in a barbarous age that had not been enlightened by a Boström, but simply and exclusively pure reason, that is to say, Professor Boström's opinions, for nobody else's opinions will he admit to be reason at all, then of course Christianity and the Boström-dogmas agree, not only in the main but also in the details. If we are at liberty to re-christen Boströmism as Christianity, no doubt Christianity and Boströmism agree. And by the same rule, if we are at liberty to call the Boström-heresy by the name Augsburg Confession, or Brahminical mythology, then the Boström-dogmas agree with the Augsburg Confession, or with Brahminism, or with whatever you please. But what is to be said of the honour and honesty of a person who resorts to so disgraceful an abuse of language?

Professor Boström then reasons, that, as God is good, he never can have made anything evil, especially such a being as the devil, or such a place as hell, for darkness cannot be obtained from light, nor cold from warmth-giving materials.⁴ And all this follows forsooth, because, however physically impossible, it is nevertheless philosophically true, that "an effect that takes place in time is always its own first cause." But, as the question of hell involves the doctrine of punishment, the professor seizes the opportunity of expounding a little more at large, especially in the second edition, his own theory on that subject, which, as we have seen in a previous extract, he piques himself upon, as differing from everybody else's.

Our object is not to vindicate the Protestant clergy of Sweden;—that we leave them to do for themselves,—neither is it formally and in order to refute Professor Boström's sophisms, which fortunately are of such a nature, that to Catholics they require only to be enounced and their worthlessness is evident. We are writing for English Catholics, and our object is merely to lay before them a sketch of what is going on in another part of the world.

Dr. Boström tells us (p. 16) that all writers except Plato, but especially all theologians, "who in all ages have blindly adhered to the Bible," have mistaken between the means and

⁴ The physical illustrations are particularly unfortunate. Both these things can be done; and the production of darkness from light is just the *experimentum crucis* that established the wave-theory of light. From dealers in a marine-store shop of a science that includes everything, one does not expect accuracy in anything, but ignorant blunders are what one does expect from the crazy charlatanism that makes such professions.

the end of punishment;—that (p. 19) “the object of punishment is the bettering of the individual punished, and, through him, of the punisher and all other rational beings, all being members of the same organism.” It is singular, that his favourite, the great Plato (whom he admits to have understood the matter), took a different and broader view. He makes Socrates say, at the latter end of the *Gorgias*:—

“It is fit, that one, who is rightly punished by another, should either become better and be himself advantaged, or be an example to others, that they may be deterred from evil by the sight of what he suffers. Those who are thus beneficially to themselves punished by the gods and men, are they who have committed curable sins, and receive assistance through pains and sufferings both here and in Hades. For otherwise it is not possible to be freed from unrighteousness. But of extreme criminals, who on account of such wickedness are incurable, examples are made, and they are not themselves in any way benefitted by it, being incurable; but others are benefitted, who see them, on account of their crimes, suffering the greatest, painfullest and frightfullest torments *for all eternity* (τὸν αἰὲ χρόνον), absolutely set up as examples there in the prison of Hades, a spectacle and admonition to all the unjust that may come” (hereafter exist).

Again, in the *Phædo*, Socrates, urging the importance of study and a good life, because the soul can take nothing with it to Hades, except the wisdom and virtue it has acquired on earth, says:—

“It is stated that every one who dies is handed over to his *dæmon*, whose lot he was when living, who proceeds to lead him to a certain place, where all will be judged together, and then conducted to Hades by the guide appointed for that purpose. Having there obtained what he ought to obtain, and remained the appointed time, he is again brought hither by another guide, and that this is continued through many long periods . . . The orderly and wise soul readily follows its guide, and does not ignore the present (*i.e.* understands its lot and the object of it); but the sensual soul, impassioned of the body, fluttering round it and the visible place, after much struggling and suffering, is, at length, by violence and with difficulty led away by the appointed *dæmon*; and having come to the spot where the other souls are, the impure soul that has committed any of these crimes, or is defiled with unjust murders, or has done things cognate to these and the deeds of cognate souls, is shunned and avoided by all, and none will be its companion or guide. It thus wanders in every kind of difficulty till certain times are past, after which it is brought by necessity to its fitting abode. But the soul that has passed through life in purity and moderation has the gods for companions and guides, and each of them inhabits his appropriate habitation.”

This last passage, it will be observed, is introduced by Socrates with λέγεται, “it is reported,” and thus we know not

to what extent the view it offers of the case had the great master's consent. If it had, the former passage will compel us to consider the "fitting abodes" and "appropriate habitations," here spoken of as eternal. The former passage, however, from the *Gorgias*, is undoubtedly that which gives the opinion of Socrates; and, according to that, as long as there exists a being with free will, and, therefore, capable of sin, it may be man, or angel, or spirit, the sufferings of the incurable examples cannot be said to be, as Dr. Boström would maintain, "without an object."

So much for the view of punishment, both in this world and the next, entertained by Plato, who, according to Dr. Boström, did understand the matter. But Dr. Boström assures us, in direct opposition to Plato,^j that the death, whether of the just or unjust, is only a passage to a higher and better life, and that the state, when it takes the life of an offender, "only frees him from a sensuality over which reason has no power." If this theory be true and complete, observes Dean Beckman, why should the professor be so horrified at the Dalecarlian mother? She saw in her child "a sensuality over which reason had no power," and she freed the child from it, and promoted it "to a higher and better existence." Surely, on Dr. Boström's principles, this was a meritorious and loving deed, nay, a heroic act of mercy, for the mother, in order to free the child from its sensuality "and promote it to a better existence," exposes herself to the vengeance of the law. It is true that, in the professor's language, the source of all evil is "sensuality" (*sinnlighet*), and the poor woman calls it "the Devil," but the two things are here identical, and the difference in the name cannot alter the ethical character of the act. If we abhor, as all must abhor the frightful deed, we must in reason also reject the professor's theory. In fact, if his theory be true, and if he can persuade the generality of men that it is so, some unphilosophical tradesmen may make grand fortunes by speculating in halts, prussic acid, pistols, strychnine, and other instruments of suicide, for all believers in the system must, no doubt, be desirous of promotion to a higher and better existence.^k

^j Plato would be sick if he could see the follies put forward in his name by modern sophists.

^k By the way, it is a curious fact, that, according to the memoir lately presented to the Académie de Médecine by the director of the Bureau de Statistique at Paris, it is in just those countries where the modern German philosophy is most prevalent, viz. Prussia and Denmark, that the per-centage of suicides is enormously higher than in any others. The learned director attributes this to inordinate competition and gambling in trade, but this can hardly be the real reason, for England would then have a very high per-centage, whereas the

Our object here is, as we have already stated, not either formally to refute Dr. Boström, nor to vindicate the Protestant clergy of Sweden,—though the charge against them be one that equally affects the Catholic clergy throughout the world. The clergy are both able and ready to defend themselves, and Dean Beckman's masterly and well-reasoned little book has, in our opinion, so completely cut away the ground from under the philosopher's grotesque edifice, as not to leave an atom of it standing. In opposition to the professor's two positions, viz. that God, being good, cannot inflict perdition on anyone, and that eternal punishment, as having no object, is unreasonable and an insult to God's being and dignity, he proves the following:—As regards the first position,

1. "That God, in his character of the absolute good and pure love, must from his very nature react against evil.
2. "That that reaction must, by a being persevering in wickedness, be felt as perdition.
3. "That God must therefore, in his property of goodness and love, and in consequence of his very nature, inflict perdition on the being that perseveres in wickedness.
4. "That such infliction is not contrary to his nature as pure and perfect happiness."

And, as regards the second position,

1. "That the assertion that eternal punishment has no object is false.
2. "That it is not borne out, even by the professor's own theory of punishment, and consequently cannot by that theory be confirmed, even if the said theory were true, which it has been shewn not to be.
3. "That the assertion is incompatible with a sound and true conception of punishment, its significancy and its object.
4. "That the professor has, therefore, no more succeeded in shewing that the doctrine of eternal punishment is an insult to God's being and dignity, than, in general, that the doctrine of a perdition inflicted by God is so."

The little *brochure* of Simplicius Quaerens consists of a series of questions put with a caustic urbanity and polite irony, which here and there remind us of the celebrated "*Lettres de quelques Juifs*." We extract a couple of the shortest queries, which, however, may give the Professor some trouble satisfactorily to answer.

"*Jewish and Greek Notions*.—If it be so 'natural' (as the writer, without any proof, even in his improved edition, maintains), that the Christian faith, as put forth by the Apostles, 'should be mixed up with

learned director's researches assign to England an unexpectedly low percentage.

Jewish and Greek notions,' how can he explain that what the Apostles preached, and what was therefore included in their notions, viz., the Christian truth, was to the 'Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness?' Was it 'natural' that Jewish and Greek notions should be thus regarded by *Jews and Greeks*?"

"*Ethical*.—Suppose the author to see, what every one who has not lost his senses must see, viz., that the author's religious doctrine is in direct opposition to the religious confession of the community under whose laws he has placed himself, and supposing that that community requires, as the condition of the protection it gives and the advantages it grants, that its subjects with oath bind themselves, amongst other things, not to teach anything that contravenes the received religion—if the author, in spite of this, retained his place in that community, would such conduct be compatible with a rational theory of ethics, and a rational theory of rights and of society? And, supposing that the 'father of moral philosophy' were informed of the writer's remarkable conduct and position, would not the aged ironist be more scandalised than ever he was at the *mighty* sophist's conceit, and ask in wonder, is it on the principles of a rational philosophy that morals are thus attended to in the much boasted nineteenth century? And would the writer then have to answer Socrates *Yes or No*?"

The little book, "Some Thoughts, etc.," which stands fourth on the list at the head of this article, contains some useful remarks, but we have not space to notice it particularly nor give extracts. We are glad to see the philosophical Professor's mischievous and shameless *brochure* so well met, and we hope and trust that these works, more especially the strictly logical little books of Dean Beckman and Professor Myrberg, may be instrumental in saving many, and even of recalling some, from the snares which this mischievous and treacherous system holds out for the faith of the rising generation.

Τὸ δ' εὖ κρατοίη, μὴ διχορρόπως ἰδεῖν.¹

It is truly painful to think of the awful responsibility of those who spread these impious and demoralising notions among the youth of a people who seem, almost universally, to be endowed by nature with those amiable and heart-engaging qualities which Christianity has so mighty a power to call into being where they do not previously exist, and so magnificently ennobles and develops where they do. We most heartily wish that the opponents of this infidel system may be successful in their endeavours to check its progress; but oh! that these and the similar uncouth phenomena in England, Germany, and Denmark may open the eyes of all believing Lutherans and Protestants—may shew them the frightful end to which their system tends, and lead them to

¹ Æschylus, *Agam.*, 323.

take refuge on that rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

Dr. Boström concludes his book with the following sentence :

"To hell, then, with the whole of the old barbarous devil-and-hell-doctrine ; and thither also, we had almost said, with all the coarse and thoughtless beings who still in our days teach it. But of course, we cannot, as rational men, wish them any harm ; on the contrary, we wish them from our hearts all good, and especially a more enlightened and purer knowledge of Christianity, though we entertain but little hope that our wish will, in that respect, be speedily realised."

With this sentence, which deserves no comment, we dismiss the subject. Our readers by this time must be tired of Dr. Boström,^m and, should they hear more of him, may perhaps dream of Bottom.ⁿ

^m He will probably now not do much more mischief, as his later productions seem as if written for the purpose of making himself and his philosophy ridiculous. He is the true satiric drama that follows the tragic trilogy of Kant, Schelling, and Hegel. [A fixed idea gets possession of his empty skull, and rattles there like a parched pea in an empty bladder.] The idea which in his latter works has taken possession of him is, that Christianity is a thing to be manufactured by each individual for himself out of his own hallucinations, and is not in any respect a historical fact ; but historical facts are stubborn things, and are not, like the Philistines of old, to be annihilated by the jaw of an ass. The poor old man is a quizzical compound of blundering ignorance, unblushing impudence, and stupid conceit, to which now may be added senile and sedate wrong-headedness.

ⁿ The author of the foregoing article, in sending it to the friend at whose request we have consented to print it, wrote as follows : " I do not know whether you have seen the confession of guilt just published (in June, 1865) by the clergyman (Mr. Lindbeck) now under sentence of death for poisoning certain of his parishioners by mixing poison in the sacramental wine. It is indeed the most shameless and disgusting of documents, but it is very instructive. Here we have the philosophy of the modern school logically and consequently carried out. The assassin maintains that he has done right, that it is an act of holy charity to murder the sick, the poor, and the unhappy, and so free them from their misery, and promote them to a better existence. And he shamelessly asks, in conclusion, ' Who is the more guilty before God ? I, who, in defiance of human law, have freed a few sick, poor, or unfortunate people from misery, or my 'persecutors,' who, by means of human law, have brought misery on me and my family for doing a charitable action ? ' (I have not the confession before me as I now write, but I think I can so far trust my memory as to say the citations are very nearly word for word.) A more apposite comment on Boström's theory could not easily be imagined, for here we have his theory directly carried out in practice ; the clergyman promotes his people to a higher and better existence, the poor because they are poor, the rich man because he often suffers from the gout, and dismisses them to heaven on the wings of a Silbodal sacrament. I have thought it worth while to call your attention to this, however very painful a case, for it is so very instructive, and indicates so clearly the *moral* character of the modern perfidious (i.e., faith-rejecting) school."

INSPIRATION AND REVELATION.

IF the Books of Holy Scripture as received by the Christian Church be inspired, we can only form a true and adequate idea of their inspiration from themselves. We can form no such idea from any *à priori* reasoning, nor have we any argument from analogy. *How* God's Spirit should influence the mind either of the receivers or the recorders of his revelations is what no man can lay down. And the inspiration of the men whose revelations are related in Scripture, as well as the inspiration of the various writers of Scripture, is with us a solitary fact in supernatural history. We acknowledge no other line of inspired prophets than those of whom the Bible speaks : no other line of inspired writers than they who have composed the Old and New Testaments.

It is plain, at the outset of this inquiry, that some distinction is to be drawn between the writers of Scripture and those men of whom we are told in Scripture that revelation was vouchsafed to them. In many cases they are identical. Moses received revelation from God and recorded it. So did Isaiah, Jeremiah, and other writers both of the Old Testament and the New. But there were others who did not do so. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, received revelations, but composed no part of our Scriptures. If, as is possible if not probable, they ever committed their revelations to writing, we do not yet know this to be a fact. But while this distinction is true it will not, we think, affect our argument in any important respect. The inspiration of all would appear to have been essentially the same however varied in circumstances; whether they received a revelation which they only communicated orally to the men of their day, or both received such, and committed it to writing for the instruction of after ages, or only committed to writing the history of the past, or recorded the revelations made to others without receiving from God any new revelation themselves. And here an inquiry suggests itself, which must be particularly noticed ere we proceed further. It is, what is the distinction, or is there any, between revelation and inspiration? Is it ever the case that revelation is made to one who is not at the same time inspired, so far as the revelation made to him extends? We do not of course speak at all of persons to whom revelation is made, of which they are not the official and authoritative mediums of communicating from God to men. Truths before unknown were revealed to the Apostolic Churches by the Apostles: the latter were inspired, but the former were not. The question is whether revelation was in any instance given to any one as the direct medium of its communication from God to man, while inspira-

tion was at the same time denied to him. A writer upon this subject, whose work stands deservedly very high, maintains that these gifts of God are separable, and in some cases separated.^a It is with much diffidence that we would venture to differ from one whose writings have raised the Irish Church in the estimation of English Churchmen, and would be an honour to any Church or any age. But we are obliged to say that we do not think that he has advanced any sufficient grounds for the distinction he maintains, and that it is one as held by him open to very grave and serious objections. The only distinction we can see is that revelation may be described as the matter communicated, and inspiration as the manner in which it is communicated. We regard these gifts of God, however, as inseparable. We hold that in every instance God inspires the medium of his revelation, so that he communicates it as he receives it, otherwise we should place such persons on an absolute level with every one to whom an inspired medium has communicated a revelation from God, and in fact rob the revelation itself of its high authority as the communication of a message from God to man. We also hold that every inspired man receives with his inspiration such a communication as, while it very frequently does not in any degree partake of the nature of a knowledge before utterly unknown in general, or unknown to the inspired person, is yet properly of the nature of revelation. Guidance in the selection of matter for record, preservation from error in the matters recorded, and similar things, partake, in our estimation, as truly of the character of revelation, as information on a matter of which the party had no acquaintance, whether it be a matter of history or of prophecy.

One main ground on which Archdeacon Lee relies for the specific difference which he alleges to exist between inspiration and revelation is this, that while we uphold the inspiration of every part of Scripture, there are yet in Scripture many things which are not revelations. As an instance in point he gives us the sayings of Job's wife. It were easy to multiply such instances. The greater part of the book of Job is in fact an instance of the kind fully as much as the blasphemous sayings of the patriarch's spouse. The long speeches of Job's friends are not revelations, though the record of them is inspired. But the conclusion drawn from this is, in our opinion, most fallacious. It is just as true to say of all such sayings, that *they are not inspired as that they are not revelations*. Their record is inspired, but they are not for all that inspired sayings, but sayings often positively untrue. No ground then exists in these cases for the

^a *The Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, by Archdeacon Lee. Third Edition p. 27.

alleged distinction between revelation and inspiration, since the sayings in question are neither inspired nor revealed. Scripture is in their case an inspired record of uninspired utterances, and it would be as reasonable to establish from them a specific difference between inspiration and inspiration, as between inspiration and revelation.

Another reason for his alleged distinction is that several persons, as the Patriarchs, "received revelations but *were not inspired to record them.*" (Lee, p. 30). It is, we think, not fair to assume that the patriarchs never recorded their revelations. We are, in fact, ignorant whether they did or not. But let us suppose that they never did record them, still the conclusion that they were not inspired, does not follow. Are we to suppose that unless a man *placed his revelations upon record* that he was not inspired? The very contrary to this would appear from Scripture. The possessors of the various spiritual gifts in the Apostolic Churches, and among them of revelations, were surely inspired by the Holy Ghost, but to all appearance they committed few if any of their revelations to writing. But Dr. Lee should remember that inspiration was just as much given for the purpose of *oral* teaching, as for placing that teaching upon record. He has himself fully allowed this at p. 28, where he ascribes to inspiration the energy "by which the human agents chosen by God have officially proclaimed his will *by word of mouth*, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible." The fact then that the patriarchs received revelations which they were *not inspired to place in writing*, does not prove that they were *not inspired to communicate them orally* to the men of their day. The latter is inspiration just as much as the former, and we are perfectly satisfied that with the divine communication they received the inspiration to deliver it by word of mouth as they received it. Dr. Lee cannot in one place restrict his definition of inspiration to the capacity for writing, when in another he allows it its undoubtedly proper force, that, namely, of communicating in any way the divine revelation as it was received.

It is also contended in support for his theory that "the writer of the Acts of the Apostles was inspired for his task; but we are not told that he ever enjoyed a revelation" (p. 30). Little confidence can be placed on arguments from silence, and Luke may have enjoyed many revelations to the fullest extent of the meaning of that word, though we are not told of his having done so. But we may not confine our idea of the nature of revelation to any part, however important, of its functions in order to establish our theory. Revelation has a

wider scope than simply the communication from heaven of truth absolutely unknown to the recipient of it. It may be very true that inspiration is given to men without at the time, or it may be at any time, making to them a revelation of what was wholly unknown to them. But unless we define inspiration to be a mere wild unintelligible impulse to we know not what, we must suppose that it always exerts some influence in the direction of, and partaking truly of the character of, revelation, as correcting or reviving memory, correcting and guiding judgment, correcting or imparting a proper apprehension of the subject in hand, etc., etc. All this is of the nature of revelation, or the making known. And if we strip the inspiration, which we attribute to a man of everything of this kind, we reduce it to we do not well know what. It is then either nothing,—absolutely nothing but a name: or else a wild, headlong impulse, unintelligible, unreasonable, and ridiculous.

There is indeed one case brought forward by Dr. Lee from Scripture of an alleged revelation where no inspiration was vouchsafed, viz., the warning of St. Paul by the disciples of Tyre not to go up to Jerusalem (Acts xxi.: Lee, p. 30). He supposes that in this instance a revelation from God was given to the disciples of Tyre to the effect that bonds and afflictions awaited Paul at Jerusalem, and that the divine communication extended to no more than this. He supposes at the same time that these Tyrians enjoyed no inspiration, and that consequently they mixed up their own conclusions with the divine revelation, and presented *as the revelation from above* what was in fact an adulterated message, viz., that the apostle “should not go up to Jerusalem.” If Dr. Lee could establish his view of this case of course we should have to submit to it, but it would be, we confess, with feelings of the deepest dismay. To our view the establishment of but one such case, presented as this is to us in the Sacred Scriptures, would most materially shake our confidence in every part of them.

For, in the first place, let us reflect that if it is true that here certain parties presented as a divine revelation what was not in fact a divine revelation, the writer of the Acts of the Apostles makes himself just as responsible for the accuracy and truth of their statement as they were themselves. It seems to us impossible to read the narrative without coming to this conclusion. He affirms that what was said was said “through the Spirit,” just as much as he affirms that it was said at all. Whatever were their representation Luke endorses it, and the view that would overthrow their inspiration would alike overthrow his own. He makes himself just as responsible for their state-

ment as they were themselves. It is not, confessedly, from Luke's account of their communication that any doubt is cast on its accuracy, but on certain other accounts scattered here and there in other parts of the book, which we put together and thence draw a conclusion unfavourable to its truth. Certainly had we but the *passage itself* to consult, no one would gather from it any other conclusion than that the writer adopts as just the representation made on this occasion by the disciples of Tyre. And now let us apply this case to other cases of a like kind. Can we not suppose *other revelations* made from time to time to other individuals without inspiration to be mixed up by them with their own human wishes and conclusions, and all presented in this adulterated form to their contemporaries as revelations from God, and all recorded by the sacred writers in the same way as Luke has recorded the revelation at Tyre? Can we not suppose this of the revelations to the patriarchs as readily as in the case before us? How are we to know that we have not been receiving as pure unmixed revelations what are not such in truth, but are so adulterated with erroneous human conclusions that they present the very opposite to what God intended? We certainly have no safeguard in the manner of recording the revelation, for no language can more apparently vouchsafe the proper transmission of the message from God to man than that in which Luke records the Tyrian revelation. Are we to be set to look out other places in Scripture,—to put them together,—to draw our inference from their combined force,—and from this deduction to separate man's part from God's in the revelation? This is the only way by which the conclusion is arrived at in the case of the Tyrians, that they presented an adulterated message. How much doubt, uncertainty, painful perplexity this would introduce, will be evident at once. Any other possible solution for the undoubted difficulty of the place would be to our mind far preferable to that which we are persuaded Dr. Lee has adopted, however unconsciously, in support of a theory which we are satisfied is without any solid foundation. We will present two, either of which seems to us far preferable.

To one of these we will merely refer, as it is well known and pretty generally accepted. It solves the difficulty by supposing that the disciples at Tyre did not, as Dr. Lee thinks, present their dissuasion to go up to Jerusalem as the Spirit's revelation, but as their own advice, grounded on and arising from the revelation that bonds and imprisonments awaited Paul at Jerusalem. We do not know that this is a forced and unnatural interpretation of the passage, and it derives considerable con-

firmation from a similar occurrence at Cæsarea a little later on (verses 11, 12), where we are told that in consequence of the prediction of Agabus, Paul's companions and the disciples there urgently entreated him not to pursue his intended journey any further. It may be that the transaction of ver. 4 is of the same nature, more briefly and therefore not so clearly told, but left in a measure to our own natural inference from a comparison of the entire narrative. We certainly greatly prefer the view to that put forward by Dr. Lee.

There is, however, another view which in some respects seems preferable. It is seldom put forward, but appears to us to be well worthy of our most serious consideration. Without actually saying that we adopt it, we will lay it before the readers of our Journal, and submit it to their criticism. It accepts the advice, or warning, or prohibition (according as we choose to consider the force of the words), in ver. 4 not as an adulterated revelation communicated through an error by the disciples, but as the pure and unmingled revelation made by the Spirit, and truly reported by those to whom it was made. It thus supposes that Paul in going up to Jerusalem acted, not in accordance with, but in opposition to the revelation of the Spirit.

Our first inquiry will be whether Paul had prior to this received any revelation from God that he was to go up to Jerusalem. There are in the Epistles to the Corinthians several references to this visit of St. Paul, which was contemplated by him for a considerable time. These references are not conclusive on the point before us, but they let us into the original and, for a long time, for a period amounting to more than a year apparently (2 Cor. viii. 10), the *only* reason for the visit, and lead us very strongly to the persuasion that Paul, in making it, was not acting in obedience to any revelation from God. In 1 Cor. xvi. the apostle speaks of the collection which had been for some time making for the church at Jerusalem, and directs the Corinthians to get ready their contribution towards it. At this time he had received no revelation from God directing him to go up, nor was he at all fully purposed as to going; he only said that if it were thought meet that he should go he was ready to do so (ver. 4). He is at this time at Ephesus, shortly before the tumult which compelled him to leave (Acts xx. 1). Soon afterwards he writes, probably from Philippi, his Second Epistle to the Corinthians. He is now at the period referred to in Acts xx. 1, 2, just before his coming into Greece. In this Second Epistle (viii. 4) he tells us what was the reason that determined him on going up to Jerusalem. It was not any divine revelation, but the urgent request of the churches of

Macedonia that he would undertake in person the ministering of their bounty to the church at Jerusalem. Up to this time, undecided as to his course, he now accepts the mission in conformity with the wishes of the Macedonian churches, and doubtless throws himself into it with all the energy of his character. Jerusalem and his own nation had been from the beginning of his career the object of his fondest desires and hopes as a missionary of Christ. It required a divine communication (Acts xxii. 18) to tear him away reluctantly from what he hoped would be his scene of labour. Sent by special direction to Gentile and distant missions, two brief and hurried visits were all he was enabled to pay to Jerusalem between his first and the visit we are now speaking of. This visit, pressed upon him on an occasion which would shew his deep love for his people, doubtless came up to him as the long hoped-for period when he might with success plead Christ's cause with Israel, and it is seized upon with the ardour and tenacity of his earnest determined will. It became, up to this period certainly without any revelation, the fixed purpose of his spirit to pay this visit to Jerusalem. Once more, from Corinth, he refers in his Epistle to the Romans to his projected visit, in terms corresponding to his motives, as mentioned in 2 Cor. viii., and which are wholly silent as to any revelation on the subject. This is but a very brief time before his address to the elders of Ephesus. All this, we think, fully accounts for the expression in Acts xx. 22, and which is so commonly regarded as containing his declaration that the visit to Jerusalem was appointed by a divine revelation.

"Bound in the Spirit" is a phrase in itself just as applicable to the fixed resolve of a strong mind bent on accomplishing its purpose, as to a revelation from the Holy Ghost to fulfil it. So Bloomfield, Rosenmüller, Middleton on the Greek article, and other authorities understand it here. See a similar expression, Acts xviii. 5. But the manner in which the phrase (*τὸ Πνεῦμα*) occurs twice in this verse seems to us to intimate a plain distinction between it as it occurs in the first clause and in the second. If *τὸ Πνεῦμα*, where it first occurs, means the Holy Spirit, it appears to us alien from the spirit of the language that it should be mentioned in a *fuller and more explanatory way* in the second. The full phrase (*τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*) would naturally occur first, the shorter (*τὸ Πνεῦμα*) would occur next, if both referred to the same object. In giving the fuller form second, Paul appears to us to distinguish the Holy Spirit there spoken of from his own spirit which he before mentioned,—a view which would appear stronger to English readers if the second phrase were translated "Holy Spirit" instead of "Holy

Ghost." Now this is the only expression which seems to intimate that Paul had received any intimation by revelation as to the visit to Jerusalem; and even though the phrase were equally capable of either interpretation, various reasons should lead us to take it as significant of the apostle's own mind rather than of the Holy Ghost.

It is of course urged, and the point urged has much force, that if the communication of the Tyrian disciples to Paul were regarded by him as a communication from the Spirit, he would not have disregarded it. We allow this to have much force, whether the *μὴ ἀναβαλεῖν* of chap. xxi. 4 be taken as a strict command, a simple warning, or an advice. We are not prepared to say what exact force these words possess, but whatever it be, we do not think the objection grounded on it sufficient to overbalance other and stronger reasons on the other side. It is doubtless improbable that Paul would on this or any occasion go counter to an intimation conveyed by revelation, but it is not at all impossible that he should. We may not make an idol of the great apostle more than of Peter, Barnabas, or other Christian men. He was liable to mistake, to sin, as they were, and he may here have fallen into error, or deliberately preferred his own will to that of God. We do not know, as we have already observed, to what extent we are to charge him with error, supposing the Tyrian disciples' dissuasion from going up to Jerusalem did really proceed from the Holy Spirit. With some preference of his own will, and that a sinful preference, we must charge him, but it need not be to the extent that might at first appear. Many mere warnings from the Spirit had already been given him as to what he was to expect at Jerusalem, and he may at Tyre, in his predetermination of purpose, have taken the communication as another such warning, or as a trial of his faith. He may have misunderstood wilfully, and therefore sinfully, the revelation; for Paul was not on all occasions inspired more than the other apostles.

But is it not really a stronger reason on the other side, that every one connected with St. Paul on this and other occasions should have adopted a view diametrically opposite to his own. It was not merely the entire Church at Tyre, but the Church at Cæsarea also, and the companions of Paul enumerated at xx. 4, including Luke, who earnestly begged him to abandon his purpose of going to Jerusalem (xxi. 12). Now Paul's companions had all heard his charge to the elders of Ephesus, in which he told them that he "went bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem." Yet they prayed him not to go there. To one or other of these suppositions we are confined: 1st, either that they did not under-

stand him to refer to the Holy Spirit, but to his own spirit when he spoke: or 2nd, that they one and all persuaded him to disregard the direction of the Holy Ghost. We suppose that if Luke and Sopater and Aristarchus and Secundus and Gaius and Timothy and Tychicus and Trophimus understood "bound in the spirit" to signify the fixed purpose of the Apostle's own mind, that that was the true signification of the words. We would be indeed sorry to place any modern interpretation of the words against that put on them by such men, who heard them uttered, and knew every circumstance of the case prior and up to that time. If we do not take this view, we must suppose that all these good and true men joined in urging Paul to disregard the communication of the Holy Spirit in order to save himself from bonds and afflictions, or possible death. Now we confess that we think it infinitely more likely that Paul, burning with zeal and love for his countrymen, should go more or less wilfully in disregard of the Spirit, than that the disciples of whom we read as his companions should one and all urge him to disobedience. Rather we think would they have acted the part of true Christian friends, imbued as they were themselves with the spirit of martyrdom, and comforted and sustained him in his purpose, if they knew that that purpose was in no measure to be ascribed to wilful obstinacy, but in obedience to a revelation from above.

Nor is their remark, when all their dissuasions were disregarded, viz., "the will of the Lord be done," any argument for their supposing that Paul was acting in conformity with a revelation. Things are done every day in direct opposition to God's expressed will which yet accomplish His purpose. The act of Judas was such, and no one who holds the theory of an overruling providence of God, can deny that such is the case in regard of every event of life, whether it be in itself pleasing or offensive to Him. There is therefore no contradiction in supposing that Paul went counter to an expressed revelation, and that yet in his doing so he accomplished the will of God. Nor is it without force to reflect that Paul himself does not advance any supposed revelation as his reason for disregarding the admonitions of his friends (xxi. 13). His doing so would have silenced them at once. He simply refers to his own will and purpose, and seems to us throughout this part of his life to have fallen into the error of courting persecution and coveting martyrdom, which was not uncommon in that age of zeal, with which Ignatius seems to have been strongly tinged, as we learn from his Epistle to the Romans, and at which Gibbon characteristically sneers.

With this view the repeated revelations from God as to the

dangers awaiting Paul in Jerusalem exactly agree, while they appear to us out of place on the contrary view. No sooner has Paul accepted the urgent entreaty of the Macedonian Churches, and set his face resolutely to go up to Jerusalem, than in every city to which he comes he is met with warnings from the Holy Ghost as to the dangers which await him if he pursues that course. These warnings in Greece and Macedon he sets aside, and sails for Asia. On his nearer approach to the scene of danger, at Tyre, the seaport of Phœnicia, he is again encountered with the ominous communication. He pursues his route and arrives in Judæa. He is at Cæsaria, and still at this the eleventh hour he may avoid the peril. A prophet is sent on the special mission from Jerusalem to give him the last warning he can receive before his arrival at Jerusalem. What was the object of their numerous oft-repeated revelations meeting him at every stage of his way? On the view that God was warning him against going, and giving him the opportunity of withdrawal, they are natural, reasonable, and merciful. To us they do not appear in this light, on the contrary view. Are we to regard them as trials of the Apostle's faith? We think one intimation would have been enough for this; nor does it seem to us agreeable with God's usual dealings with His people to send them on a mission which, without any revelation, is plainly one of peril, and then at every step of their way bring vividly and pointedly before them all the terrors that await them. Rather, as seems to us, He draws a veil over coming dangers, and suffers them one by one to unfold themselves as the way opens out, and the courage of the confessor or martyr grows strong as each new peril is met and overcome. Or are we to suppose that God was thus holding up to the Church's admiration, or the world's astonishment, the grand picture of a hero going on with open eyes and dauntless heart to a fate of whose severity he was ever receiving fresh intimations? Neither do we think this God's way of dealing as exhibited in Scripture. Ignatius seems to us to have had the mind which on this supposition it must needs be thought that God sought to exhibit in St. Paul. "May I enjoy," he says, "the wild beasts that are prepared for me; which I also wish may exercise all their fierceness upon me: and whom for that end I will encourage, that they may be sure to devour me, and not serve me as they have done some whom out of fear they have not touched" (Ep. to Romans v.). We do not think this the desirable spirit; nor do we think it what God would seek to produce. It is conformable neither to the precepts or the example of that good Shepherd who gave His life for the sheep, yet would have shunned the cup of suffering if He could. In low-

liness and meekness, without parade or ostentation, God led His own Son as a lamb to the slaughter, unlike those heathen priests who in gorgeous robes led their victim, dressed in garlands and sprinkled with wine, in procession to altars decked with herbs and burning with incense, while strains of music filled the air around. We think the notion that God, in giving the repeated revelations to Paul on his way, was but holding out to the world the grand display of a voluntary martyr, to be more like the heathen pattern than the divine example.

We cannot avoid thinking that in the result to Paul of this visit to Jerusalem, we see that which, to all appearance, stamps his conduct as rash and self-willed. We are far from saying that no good result to the cause of Christ which he had at heart came from it, for such certainly did. His public testimonies before the Roman governors and Agrippa, and the great council of the nation, were most valuable. But all this was accompanied with an amount of suffering and chastening to the Apostle personally, which seems designed to check the feelings of which our theory supposes him to have been guilty. Repeated attempts upon his life mark this period. But far beyond such must that protracted imprisonment at Cæsarea have affected him (Acts xxiv. 27). During this period, so far as we can learn from the Book of Acts, Paul seems to have been laid upon the shelf. An occasional interview between him and Felix, for the latter's interested purposes; the free admission of his friends to him in his confinement; these appear the most notable events of two long years. He seems to have produced no effect either on the Jewish or Gentile elements of which Cæsarea was composed, nor even come in contact with them. He seems to have written no epistle to the churches during this long period. As far as we can judge, he was for the time almost laid aside from his Master's service, left to reflect, in forced inaction, most trying to his spirit, on the self-will which had, in spite of repeated warnings, led him to his Cæsarean imprisonment. It was most unlike his subsequent imprisonment of about an equal length at Rome. This was a time of constant and full occupation to Paul as a preacher and an apostle (xxviii. 30, 31). He was in constant communication with the religious activity of the metropolis of the world, into which were daily pouring crowds from every quarter, and whence crowds were perpetually going. Hence, too, he wrote several of those epistles which were to guide and instruct the Church for all time, as those to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians. But nothing of this religious activity marked his imprisonment at Cæsarea. He had, as our theory supposes, put himself heedlessly into a post to which he was not called, and

God would shew him that He could for two long years maintain his cause even without the labours of a Paul.

His whole conduct too, subsequently to his arrival at Jerusalem, seems to us inconsistent with, and as it were the withdrawal of those somewhat rash professions in which he had previously seemed to court persecution and even death. In our minds he does not appear to carry out that readiness for death at Jerusalem which he avowed at Tyre, Melitus, and Cæsarea. Every lawful means in his power he uses to guard himself against insult, stripes, and death: some have even supposed that for his conduct to this end before the Sanhedrim he has condemned himself (Acts xxii. 6; xxiv. 21). He pleads his Roman citizenship to save himself from scourging: he sets the Jewish Sanhedrim at variance to procure in it a party in his favour: he sends his nephew to the chief captain to warn him of the Jewish plots against his life, and to procure the aid of the military power: he appeals to distant Cæsar to avoid a tribunal before the blood-thirsty council at Jerusalem. We do not condemn him for any of these things: we think he was but carrying out the rules of Christian prudence. But we do see an inconsistency between this careful guardianship of his person and his life, and his former rash exposure of both, and, so far, his own implied disapproval of the spirit which had actuated him on his way to Jerusalem. The aspect of danger reminds him that his life may have yet more valuable ends than to give it up a prey to a mob or a council of fanatics: his weary imprisonment teaches him he *might* have then been spreading the cause of his Master instead of lying idle and unoccupied in a new capital, one of whose great parties hated him too much to listen to his message, and the other was too careless of his message to listen to it. He was too wise and too full of grace not to learn the lesson. He withdrew from the ranks of the voluntary martyrs, whose conduct, while admirable in some respects, is ridiculous in others, but only to enroll himself in that number who were prepared and ready, and sometimes even full of joy, to be martyrs when God's will and not their own rashness should lead them to give up their lives.

In bringing this paper to a conclusion, we will briefly refer to another reason on which Dr. Lee relies, in our judgment, without sufficient grounds for his distinction between revelation and inspiration. It is their supposed difference of source, "Revelation being the peculiar function of the eternal Word; Inspiration, the result of the agency of the Holy Spirit" (Lee, p. 29). We can see no grounds from Scripture for laying down the rule that revelation is the *peculiar* function of the second Person of

the Trinity, but the contrary. We find Simeon receiving a revelation from the Holy Ghost (Luke ii. 26) : we have our Lord telling his disciples that from the Spirit they were to receive information of things to come, which are surely revelations (John xvi. 12—14) : we find Paul declaring that the Spirit reveals things before unknown to the Church, and that He is the source of revelations to the Apostles and Prophets of the Christian Church (1 Cor. ii. 10 ; Eph. i. 5). With such declarations as these in Scripture we do not see how revelation can be called the *peculiar* function of the Son. It is his function no doubt, but not peculiar to Him. The Holy Spirit is also the source as of inspiration, so of revelation also, for we cannot see grounds in Scripture for Dr. Lee's distinction of Christ as the source, the Spirit as the channel of revelation (p. 120) : or if any distinction is to be made, we think the best is that which regards the Father as the source of all revelation, whether made to man by the Son or by the Holy Spirit. We do not then agree to the distinction which Dr. Lee, in his valuable work, has drawn between Revelation and Inspiration. We think them, if different, yet inseparable, and different only in so far as inspiration may be called the manner, and Revelation the matter of the divine communications. We scarcely venture to hope that anything we could say, even were it to draw the attention, could alter the opinion of the writer to whose views we have referred in this paper. We can only express our judgment that were Dr. Lee to modify his view in this respect, he would remove from his work that which mars its effect. He has given us, undoubtedly, the ablest defence in our own, or perhaps any language, of what we esteem the orthodox doctrine of inspiration : he would then, we think, present one as nearly faultless as it is, perhaps, possible for any human composition to arrive at.

D. A.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We wish our readers to understand that we cannot be held responsible for the opinions of our contributors and correspondents. The utmost we can do is to keep a careful eye upon the literary character of their communications, and to see that they do not transcend the limits of fair criticism and lawful inquiry.]

NEBUCHADNEZZAR AND HIS SUBJECTS.

WE must leave to time and advancing knowledge to put an end to the scepticism which still prevails in some quarters touching the interpretation of the cuneiform inscriptions. It is, however, important that the interpreters themselves should do nothing to foster the unbelief of such Orientalists as Ewald and Renan. Unfortunately, much that was published during the infancy of cuneiform research, and which further study has shewn to be unfounded and misunderstood, is still quoted at second and third hand, and so brings discredit upon the labours of the cunealoger. When a writer in Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* cites the translation of Nebuchadrezzar's Birs-i-Nimrūd-Cylinder inscription, made by Dr. Oppert at a time when only a word here and there was known with certainty (although the far more accurate version of Sir H. Rawlinson is to be found in many easily-procurable books^a), it is time to warn ordinary readers against trusting overmuch to translations of Assyrian inscriptions made ten or more years ago. The discovery of Essar-haddon's "Royal Library" and its invaluable contents, the special inquiry of many minds, and other causes, have advanced our knowledge of ancient Assyrian so rapidly as to make it possible to give a rendering of Nebuchadrezzar's inscription above referred to, in which the number of unknown or doubtful words will be but small. The following translation will be seen to differ materially from the antiquated version of Dr. Oppert, especially in one important point. It may, however, be safely depended upon as conveying the true sense of the original except in such words as are italicised. The inscription is as follows:—"Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, the powerful chief, the established prince of the heart of Merodach, the supreme ruler,^b the exalter of Nebo, the glorious potentate,^c whom the great gods

^a For example, Loftus's *Chaldea and Susiana*, pp. 29, 30.

^b *Isaacu*, from the Janban *saq*, "a head," and *is* which the syllabaries translate by *sadu'u*, a verb akin to *شيد* and *شيد*. The final *-cu* is a common affix which we may compare with the Basque final suffixed article *-c*, and the Etruscan *-ak* (as in *puak* ("child") compared with *puia* and *puil*, and in *phruntak* (? *Apvrrh*) in the bi-lingual inscription of Pisaurum). *Ikki* in the Third Achæmenian—"at" or "in," like the Mordwin *ga*, e.g. *master-ga* ("on the earth"), *kesh-ga* ("through the door").

^c *Muddâ*, nomen agentis from *𐎢𐎠*, whence *idatî*, which is found in the India House Inscription (col. iv., l. 25), where the Moon-god is called *mudammîq sa idatî-ya*, "strengtheners of my sovereignty."

have appointed (úzuná) to live for sovereignty, the controller of the *undefiled*^a (?), builder of Bit Saggat and Bit Tzida (am) I. Behold, Merodach the great lord has powerfully formed me, and has urged me to construct his buildings. Nebo, inspector of the abundance of heaven and earth, has given my hand the sceptre of royalty to hold. Bit Saggat, the palace of heaven and earth, the seat of the supreme lord of the gods Merodach, (and) Bit Cua, the shrine of his lordship, glittering with gold *firmly* (?)^c did I erect. Bit Tzida strongly did I build, and with silver, *brilliant* (?) gold, hewn^d stone, fir, (and) cedar did I finish its magnificence.^e The temple of the ** spheres,^f the treasury of Babylon I built, I finished, and with masonry and *zakur*^g stone I reared its head on high. Behold, *the stages* (?)^h of the temple of the seven spheres, the treasury of Borsippa, which a former king had founded, and had built up 42 cubits,ⁱ but had not raised its head, from length of time had become ruined,^j and its cisterns were dilapidated.^k The turret^l and the gallery were torn down, and its brickwork (and) the masonry of its coping were crumbled away,^m and the brickwork of its mound was piled up like a heap. Merodach, the great lord, inclined my heart to rebuild it. I did not change its site, and I did not dig up its floor. In a peaceful month, on an auspicious day, the brickwork of its mound and the masonry of its coping (which were in ruins) I repaired, and I strengthened its *ruins* (?)

^a So rendered by Dr. Hincks, who derives *dhakha* (?) from طاح ("inquinatus est.")

^c *Sallaris*, adverb from שׁל, which seems to imply firmness.

^d *Era'a*, from ער.

^e *Sibir* or *sipur*, which like שׁו in Job xxvi. 13, may be either "splendour" or "a roof." It is, however, far more probably the latter.

^f *An-ci*, i.e. "the divine place." The word is found on a brick legend of Burna-buriyas, wherein he calls the sun-god *Inu gal an-ciá*, "the great lord of the two spheres." So Rim-zallus speaks of Assur as "king of the two worlds," the idea being here expressed by the D. P. of divinity, followed by the symbol of "five" (to denote the five planets) and the sign of duality.

^g This was a kind of marble much used by the Assyrian monarchs. It seems to have given its name to the Zagros Montes, whence it was brought.

^h The word is *mihqut*; compare מר (2 Sam. xx. 13). But it may, like *mihqitta* below, mean "the ruins" from מר, מר, etc.

ⁱ *Amma*, expressed by a character which has the phonetic power of *hu*. It is very often met with in Assyrian inscriptions as a measure of length *only*, like מן in Hebrew.

^j *Innamu*, from נ. Whenever found it can only bear the meaning given above. It is akin to the Arabic نَم, which Freytag translates "debilis, infirmus," and the Hebrew נ (compare the Homeric use of *ήμω*).

^k Literally, "its exits-of-water were-brought-not-to-stand" (*la-sutesuru mutsie-mi-he-sa*).

^l *Zuannu*, from the same root as *uzuná* above, which I have rendered "appointed." It is the Hebrew ז, akin to זר, זר, זר, זר ("ornare"); see Davidson's Fürst's *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, pp. 51-2.

^m *Uptátcir*, from ער.

(*mihqita-sa*), and I placed a record of my name in the corners of its edifice [literally 'ruins']. I set my hand to build it and to rear its head, and as it was of old strongly did I build it, and like (it was) in former days did I rear its head. O Nebo, the powerful son, the supreme * * *,^p the ruler, the exalter of Nebo, do thou for ever^q *cause (?)* my buildings to be strong; and a long-lasting house, many children,^r the establishment of the throne, a continuance of regnal-years, the destruction of foes, (and) the plentiful captures of enemies greatly extend thou. In thy mighty guardianship, O establisher of the *pillars (?)*^s of heaven and earth, *extend (?)* the lengthening of my days, (and) the generation of children. In the presence of Merodach, king of heaven and earth, (and) the fathers that have gone (to) thee,^t love my buildings [and] the glory of my *authority (?)*. May Nebuchadrezzar, the royal builder, be established before thy face."

This inscription affords sufficient material to every Semitic scholar for discovering the close similarity that exists between the Hebrew and the Babylonian in the reign of Nebuchadrezzar—the Augustan era of the language. Naturally a few foreign words, heirlooms of the ancient Turanian tongue, still lingered even in the court dialect.^u The name of the king itself contains one of these. *Cuduri* is a Janban vocable, a common compound of Elamite names, which originally meant "servant" (as in *חורלמי*, "servant of Lagamir"), and hence "soldier" and "officer." Even in Assyria the number of non-Semitic words found in the royal inscriptions, more or less disguised, is considerable; and the mass of the people still more impregnated their speech with the shreds and relics of the old tongue. Hence the difficulty of interpreting the contract cylinders and other records of private individuals, which are characterized by the plentiful use of Janban words, the employment of hybrid forms, and the utter disregard of all grammatical proprieties. In speaking of "Janbans," I am

^p *Truccalluv*; the root would be *צל*.

^q *Khadis*, adverb from *khad*, which equals Hebrew *עד*.

^r *Nablits*; the root would be *בלץ*, which I believe to mean "strong" or "steadfast."

^s *Littuti*, from *לר*. It signifies "births" and "tribute" equally often.

^t *Puluwug* perhaps has this meaning, though the ideograph for it seems rather to represent a door or window. In the syllabaries the ideograph in question is explained by *pulug* on the Janban side, and *puluccu* on the Assyrian side. In the next line the ideograph is doubled, and explained by *pulug*, and *palluccu*.

^u The sense of this sentence is not quite clear, though the meaning of all the words is fully known. We may compare the following passage from the India House Inscription of Nebuchadrezzar (col. vi.): "Nabopolassar, my exalted father (*abi ali-ya*), king of Babylon, king of multitudes, who-is-gone (*alig*) to the abode of the gods."

^v Several instances occur in the inscription given above. The word which I have translated "controller" is a relic of the Janban. This word, *saccana-cu*, is particularly interesting as being the original of the "Chaldaic" *סנא* or *סנא* of Ezra and Daniel. *Cina* or *gina* in Janban signified "chief," as in the hybrid *Sarru-gina* (Sargon), and *sag*—"caput." Classical writers tell us that at the Sakaean feast, instituted by Cyrus, and held annually in Babylon, a lord of misrule was appointed called *Zoganes*.

not to be understood as giving assent to any particular theory or belief. The word is merely a makeshift for want of a better term. "Babylonian" can only be applied to the Semitic dialect of the Casdim. "Chaldean" would be most inappropriate, as the Kaldai were an aggregate of nomadic tribes who settled in later times at the mouth of the Persian Gulf, and "Akkadian" is not only unmeaning but also incorrect, inasmuch as *Akkad* ("the highlands") was the mountainous country to the north-east of the Tigris, and had nothing to do with the alluvial plain of the Euphrates. "Janban," therefore, seems to me to be, for the present at least, the best name that can be found, as it is not likely that Ibn Wahshiya would have *invented* this ethnic title, and he was doubtlessly in possession of data which have long since perished. At the same time, it must be remembered that the reading of the word in question is not quite certain. Not only are the diacritical points a cause of doubt, but owing to the age and corruptness of the MSS. we cannot altogether rely upon the correctness of the letters themselves. According to Hêrodotus (vii., 61, 150), the Persians, originally called Artæi by themselves, were known among the Greeks by the name of Κηφῆνες. This name they received from their king "Kêpheus, son of Bêlus," but afterwards changed it on the marriage of Perseus, son of Danaë and Zeus, with Andromeda, daughter of Kêpheus. Now the Persians, at least the people so called, belonged to the Aryan race, and had no connection either with the Semitic *Belus* or his Janban correlative, *Inu*. They were identical with the Medes, whose primitive title was *Αριοι (Hêrod., vii., 62), and who had separated from their kinsfolk in *Aryanem-vâêjô* (the mountainous reservoirs of the Oxus and Jaxartes), and spread themselves north of the Paropamisus as far as the Caspian at an early period. According to the Zend-avesta, they successively occupied Sughdhu (Sogdiana), Mouru (Merw), Bakhdhî (Balkh), and Nisayâ (Nisæa),* and it is not until the sixth creation of Ahura-mazda that Harôyu (Herat, probably,) is mentioned. Not before the fourteenth century B.C., however, does the Aryan invasion of India seem to have taken place. The new settlers first established themselves in the Punjab; and the hymns of the Rig-Veda had been composed before that the Zoroastrian schism arose, and a fresh band of emigrants had started for the west. These last steadily advanced, and finally, under the Akhâmenian princes, made themselves masters of Turanian Elam. It can only be by prolepsis, therefore, that the mythical Kêpheus is called a Persian monarch. He ruled over the same district as was afterwards under the sway of Cyrus and Darius, but both he and his subjects belonged to a totally different race. So, by a similar proleptic figure, Ovid (*Met.*, iv., 212)

* Nisa or Nyssa is found as an Aryan local name from the Punjab to Greece. It is literally "a settlement," from *si* ("to lie") and the preformative *ni*. It is uncertain from which special Nyssa Dionysus, "the god of Nyssa," took his name. The ancients generally supposed it to be an Indian town of that name (Pliny, vi., 23), on the mountain near where Apollônios of Tyana is said to have found the thyrsus of Bacchus.

speaks of Orchamus, the seventh in descent from Bélus (*i.e.*, *Inu*) as tyrannizing over "the Achæmenian cities." Bélus, among classical writers, is the general eponyme of the Assyrians and Babylonians, irrespective of their ethnical and philological relations. *Inu* ("lord"), the supreme god of the Janbans, was replaced by Bilu (𐎶𐎵) after the rise of the Semitic supremacy, and the latter name was therefore adopted without question by the Greek fable-mongers. It formed a convenient starting-point and background for every legend. Kêphêne, then, a word equally un-Aryan and un-Semitic, must have been the nomenclature of the ancient (Turanian) inhabitants of Elam or Nummi,* who traced their descent from the same ancestors as their Janban neighbours—a fact fully corroborated by the decipherment of the cuneiform; and in making him a son of Bélus western writers reckoned Kêpheus among the Janban race. Indeed, this is expressly asserted as well in the explicit statement of Dikæarchus (*Eustath. ad Dion.*, 767, Steph. Byz., s. v. *Χαλδαίοι*) that the Chaldeans were at first called Kêphênes from Kêpheus† until the time of Khaldæus,‡ the fourteenth in descent from Ninus, and builder of Babylon, as in the mythi which describe Kêpheus as an Ethiopian prince. Now "Ethiopian" among the ancients meant pretty much the same as "Turanian" does in modern works. We all remember the divided race of Ethiopians of *Odys.*, i. 22-24., those "last of men," of whom one part dwelt in the land of the sun-setting and the other in the land of the sun-rising. It is to the latter of these that Apuleius (lib. xi., p. 364) refers when he speaks of "Ethiopians and Arians, born of the sun-god, whose rays first illuminate their country." They were the Dravidians of Hindustan, who, Eusebius (*Chron.*, p. 26) says, "leaving their country on the Indus, came and settled in Egypt." In reference to these we read in Philostratus, "The Indians are the wisest of all men: the Ethiopians are a colony from them, and they inherit the wisdom of their forefathers." These forefathers at one time extended their dominion over Western Asia and Europe,§ having supplanted the pigmy race that is still represented by the Andamanners, the Negritos of Malaya, and the "Hairymen" of Yesso. Many are the indications of their wide-spread power found in the folklore of succeeding populations. The *Iliad* places them on the shores of the circumambient ocean, the hosts of the gods, whose history was already lost in the night of time. They were the "Good-folk" of Ireland, the dwarfs

* *Numma* in Janban—"a highlander," whereof the Semitic *Elam*, the Third Achæmenian *Khapar*, and the Persian *Uwaj*, are translations. Sir H. Rawlinson reminds us of the Wogul *numma* ("heaven") and *numan* ("high").

† A fragment of Hellanikus makes out that the Chaldeans, on the death of Kêpheus, "ex Babylone militantes," occupied Chocha, and were then for the first time called Chaldeans.

‡ He is called Khaalus or Khalaus by Ktésias ap. Syncell. Bêlokhus and Belleparês or Bêleus, the only royal names Ktésias knew anything about, have been made to do duty twice over. Consequently the number of kings has been doubled, Khalaus appearing as the twenty-eighth instead of the fourteenth successor of Ninus.

§ They seem to have been the primitive "Bronze-men" of the Swiss lakes.

of Germany, the Duergars of the North, the Kabeiri and Telkhines^a of the Greeks. Of them Stephanus Byz. states that they "were the first nation constituted in the world, the first which enacted laws and taught reverence to the gods." This, at all events, holds good with regard to Chaldea and Assyria.

It must be remarked, however, that all the mythi do not make Kêpheus an Ethiopian. They display their usual indifference to the laws of self-consistency. The common story is that set forth by Apollônios, that Kêpheus was son of Bêlus, and king of Æthiopia. Ovid (*Met.*, iv., 662) details how Andromeda was exposed to the sea-monster and rescued by Perseus, and how that hero married her after changing Phineus, the brother of Cepheus, into stone. It is at least noticeable that "the Assyrian Lycabas" (*Met.*, v., 60) and Semiramis-sprung Polydæmon (v., 85) were amongst the courtiers of Cepheus, slain by Perseus, the Aryan conqueror.^b But according to Pomponius Mela (i., 11), Cepheus was a Phœnician (the son of Phœnix, whose grandfather and son both bore the name of Belus). Like Pliny (v., 14), he calls him king of Joppa, a town built "ante diluvium" (or, as Pliny has it, "antiquior terrarum inundatione;" see Solin., 34, 1). The "fabulosa Ceto," from which Andromeda was saved, was preserved there as late as Roman times. Pliny again (vi., 85) refers to the same belief. He says that Æthiopia was "illustrious and powerful even as early as the reign of Memnon during the Trojan war; and that its empire extended over Syria, and the shores of Italy, in the age of king Cepheus, is clear from the legend of Andromeda." From this we gather that Joppa traced its origin back to the Janban epoch, before the Semites had fallen upon them from the south. It is remarkable that Italy should be included in the ancient Æthiopian empire, but ethnology has fully confirmed the statement. Kêpheus may have been a Phœnician prince, but it was when Phœnicia had a Turanian population. And his traditional connection with such mutually distant countries seems to argue that Kêphêne was a general ethnic name. In the same way Memnôn is

^a Thilgamus is mentioned as a king of Assyria by Ælian (*Hist. Anim.*, xii., 21). Pliny (vi., 35) says that the Ethiopians were so named from Æthiops, the son of Vulcan. Renan, however (*Hist. des Lang. Sém.*, p. 476), disputes the connection of Vulcan with Telkhin, which he identifies with Tubalcain. Kuhn (*Zeitschrift*, i., 179, 193) would connect the word with the Zend *drukhe* ("lie"); Banks., *druh*; Germ., *trügen* and *lügen*!

^b Perseus may however be a type of the conquering Semites, as Dr. Donaldson believes (*Varr.*, p. 23), considering that "the name of the hero's weapon, *κρηνη*, is undoubtedly Semitic" (κρη). The story of Kephalîôn (*ap. Fragm. Hist. Gr.*, vol. iii., p. 626) points the same way. He tells us that Perseus, son of Danaë, being defeated by (the Aryan) Dionysus, son of Semelê, landed on the coasts of Assyria with 1000 ships, and took refuge with the king Belimus in the six-hundred-and-fortieth year of the foundation of the Assyrian empire (see Sir G. C. Lewis's *Hist. Survey of Astron. of Ancients*, pp. 415-16). Perhaps, however, as is often the case, two distinct mythi have become mixed up together. And certainly the founder of Mykênæ, the "destroyer" (ἡρσέως) of the monsters of the West, bears but little resemblance to the "horseman" (ἵππος) whose steed reminds us of the winged bulls and horses of Assyria and Palestine.

connected with both Egypt and Assyria. Memnôn (first mentioned in *Odys.*, xi., 522, and apparently iv., 188), the son of Tithônus,* the builder of Susa (see Hêrod., v., 53, 54) and Eôs, led the Assyrian troops, according to Diodôrus, from Larissa "to Troy in the reign of Teutamus, who was the twentieth king from Ninus and Semiramis; the Assyrians at that time possessing the empire of Asia; and Priam . . . had sent to him, under the command of Memnôn, ten thousand Assyrians and as many Persians, with two hundred chariots."

From the preceding considerations I suppose it to be possible that Ibn Wahshiya's الحنبان is a corrupt reading for ال كيبان. The latter word may have some connection with *kip* ("an offspring"), which appears in the common title, *Kiprat-arbat*, or "four peoples," the "nations" over whom Tidal, or rather Θαργαλ (*tur-gal*, "great chief"), as the Septuagint writes it, held rule. As, however, the true reading is uncertain, it will be best to retain "Janban," though possibly wrong, in fault of a better word.

Whatever may be their name, the domination of the Turanians seems to have been a long one. They were the originators of writing, as far as we know; the hieroglyphic symbols, of the primitive forms of which the cuneiform characters are corrupt modifications, having had values which shew the Turanian nature of the language. Pliny (vii., 57) says, "Litteras semper arbitror Assyrias fuisse," and according to Simplicius (ad Arist., ii., p. 123), astronomical observations had been made at Babylon for nineteen hundred and three years before Kallisthenês' visit to that city (B.C. 331). With this agrees the assertion of Bêrôsus and Kritodêmus (ap. Plin., vii., 57), that the phenomena of the heavens had been carefully noted down upon burnt-brick tablets by the Babylonians four hundred and ninety years anterior to the reign of Phorôneus in Greece (B.C. 1753), though Epigenês—"gravis auctor in primis"—extends the number of years to seven hundred and twenty. It is curious that the mythi have "stellated" Cepheus and his wife Cassiopeia with their daughter and son-in-law (Cic., *Tusc.*, disp. v., 3). Cassiopeia, by the way, seems to be connected with Casius or Cassius,† the name of several mountains in Western Asia, especially the famous one commemorated by Pliny (v., 18); and perhaps also with Cau-casus, though the latter is derived by Pliny (vi., 19) from the Scythic *Graucanus* "nive candidus," Isidôrus adding that *casis* is Scythic for "snow." At all events, Kassiopê or Kassiopeia, the Æthiopian, would claim some affinity with ωω. Josephus (*Antiq.*, i., 6, 2) says that "the Æthiopians are both by themselves and by all in Asia called Χουσαῖοι," and Susa, the capital of Elam (*i. e.*, the seat of the Asiatic Æthiopians), was situated in the district called

* Tithônus is the ἀμφιόκη γῆς, "the morning grey," which precedes the dawn (*Il.*, vii., 433). The word has the same root as τίτῃ (= "dies," *Lycoph.*, 941), Τίτῃς, probably τέρηη and τίθηός. Compare Sansk. *didhî* ("lucere")

† Compare Lappon., *kaisse*, "mons altus," Karian *Flora*, 'λῖθος.' *Grau-* in *Grau-casus* is of course the Sansk. *giris* ("mons"), Zend *gairis*, Slav. *gora*, *gora*.

Kissia (Hérod., v., 49). The Kossai, one of the chief tribes of the Elamites, who, defended by their highland fastnesses, were able, like the Circassians, the Basques, and the Lycians, successfully to resist all invaders, whether Semite or Aryan, are most probably the representatives of the Biblical *Oush*.^d Their territory is still known by the name of Khuzistan; and the inhabitants, according to Hájí Khalifeh (*Jéhan numá*, p. 272), "use the Khuzian, as well as the Arabic and Persian languages." This was apparently the country which the Gihon of Gen. ii. 13 compassed.^e It was the headquarters of the great Turanian family which spread from Malaya to Biscay. In speaking of "Turanians," I am not to be understood as giving in my adherence to any particular theory. I merely use the word in a well-established sense, as embracing those races of men whose languages are marked by the principle of agglutination. The term is a convenient one; and, in spite of Mr. H. Clarke, I shall continue to employ it until all disputes upon the subject have been settled. It is absurd to confine it to the Iberian family (*i. e.*, the family including the Tchuds, the Basques, the primeval populations of Asia Minor, and probably the Janbans). They have already a specific title of their own, and the limitation of a (hitherto) general nomenclature to them assumes the very point at issue. It must, however, be allowed that three distinct "Turanian" races have been made out,—the Iberians, the Dravidians of Hindustan, and the Caucasio-Tibetans, as Mr. H. Clarke names them. Research is rapidly widening the distinctions between these three divisions, and it is more than probable that in a few years we shall be forced to apply the term "Turanian" to the Iberians alone. But in the meanwhile we ought to acquiesce in the received ethnological phraseology. At any rate, there can be no doubt as to the affinities of the multitudinous tribes who in pre-Semitic times peopled Western Asia and Europe. As I have elsewhere stated,^f I believe that the famous Etruscans of Rhetia and Italy and the Gaels of our own island are to be included in the same family. The alluvial plains of the Euphrates and Tigris were its great focus and gathering-point. It was there that civilization had its birth, and history with civilization. In the words of Hegel:—"Agriculture, which prevails here as the primary principle of subsistence for individuals, is assisted by the regularity of seasons, which require corresponding agricultural operations: property in land commences, and the consequent legal relations, *i. e.*, the basis and foundation of the state, which becomes possible only in connection with such relations." A community of interests for the first time united the numberless nomade septs, who,

^d In the Elamite or Third Achæmenian *cush*—"to build."

^e The land of כְּשִׁי, through which the Pison flowed, may be compared with the cuneiform *Khuliyá*, or Upper Euphrates. Josephus (*Antiq.*, i., 1, 3) asserts it to be India, and identifies the Gihon with the Nile. According to Prof. Renan (*Hist. des Lang. Sém.*, pp. 468-9), Khavilah is *Cabul*, Eden *Oudýána* ("the garden"), and the Gihon the *Oxus*.

^f *Atheneum*, Sept. 17th, 1864.

though derived from one stock, had each separate prejudices and separate languages. "The absence of literature, the want of political unity, the habits of a nomadic life, tended to create an immense multitude of terms and idioms. Among semi-barbarous and wandering communities the peculiarities which we call dialects existed simultaneously and side by side."⁹ Hence it is that the same cuneiform character had so many different values in Janban, all explained by the same Semitic word. Each value, in fact, was the name of the object, represented, as in Chinese, by the same sign, among the various tribes of primeval Chaldea. It must, however, be remembered that the inventors of the cuneiform system of writing were an earlier race than even the Janbans, though belonging to the same family. Many characters, we find, represented words, the Janban equivalents of which were phonetically quite different. Such cases are to be distinguished from those in which the same sign had various powers attached to it, each power expressing the same idea in the several co-existing dialects of the Janban family of speech.

The fourteenth chapter of Genesis shews us the Elamite monarch "Chedor-laomer, and the three kings that were with him," engaged in a campaign in the West. Willingly did they make common cause with one another, for they were all of kindred blood. Not yet had the Semites seized upon the ancient seats of Janban splendour. All the great cities, not only of Babylonia, but also of Assyria—Assur, Nineveh,¹⁰ Calah—were of Turanian origin. The Semites moved upon them from the south-west. Arabia was the cradle of the latter race.¹¹ Hérodoteus (vii., 89) speaks of the shores of the Erythrean Sea as being the first home of the Phœnicians. The Erythrean Sea denoted not only the Red Sea of modern geography, but also the Persian Gulf, as well as the interjacent part of the Ocean (Pliny, vi., 28). The Persian Gulf is the Assyrian Lake of Justin (xviii., 3), the primitive settlement of the Phœnicians or typical Semites. From Arabia they passed into Egypt, overcame the Nigritian aborigines, and established the Egyptian monarchy thirty or forty centuries B.C. It was not until long afterwards that they began to migrate northward, and overturn the Turanian power in Palestine and Assyria. Later legends tabulated the two events together, assigning them both to the age of Abraham. Polyhistôr (ap. Joseph., *Antiq.*, i. 15) says:—"Kleodêmus the prophet, who was also named Malkhus, . . . relates that Abram had many sons born to him by Keturah; mentioning three of them by name—Apher, Surim, and Japhran; that from Surim the land of Assyria was denominated, and from the other two the country of Africa, they having aided Hêraklê's when he fought against Libya and Antæus; and that Hêraklê's married Apher's daughter, and had by her a son, Diodôrus, whose son was

⁹ Farrar's *Origin of Language*, p. 167.

¹⁰ In the cuneiform *Ninua*-(ci), "(the place of) the two Nini" or "deities," from the twin-temple of Ussur and Istar.

¹¹ See Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. iv., book vii., essay 2, where this question is fully examined.

Sophôn, the eponyme of the barbarian Sophacians." Recent discoveries, however, have afforded us an approximate date for the great revolution of early Asiatic history—the Semitic invasion. Tiglath-Pileser I., who we learn from the Bavian inscription was carried captive to Babylon four hundred and eighteen years before Sennacherib's campaign in Chaldea (B.C. 702), tells us that he restored "the temple of Anu and Rim," "which in former days Tsamsi-Im *patezi* of Assur, son of Ismi-Dagon *patezi* of Assur, had built," and which "after six hundred and forty-one years had fallen into decay," and remained in that state "for sixty years." Now, as was to have been expected, a brick-inscription of this Tsamsi-Im, whose era is thus fixed at cir. B.C. 1840, has been found. The language and spelling of it are Janban, the title *patezi* being one which is only elsewhere assumed by the earliest-known Chaldean kings. The word meaning "builder," found in line 5, has been connected with the Semitic *ḥḇ*; without the smallest authority however. It occurs in the brick-legends of Janban monarchs. An inscription belonging to another *patezi*, "Iri-antūq, son of Te*ba, the *patezi*," has also been unearthed at the same place. It was not until after the epoch of these princes, therefore, that the government of Assyria passed into the hands of a Semitic dynasty. But the invaluable historical tablet, which I have alluded to upon another occasion, shews that the change took place no very long time after. The coteremporaries in Assyria of the Chaldean kings Burna-buriyas and Curigaltu were Assur-bilunisisu, Buzur-Assur, and Assur-utilā—all Semitic names. So that the throne of Ninus had been occupied by the fresh-blooded children of Arabia before the accession of Khammurabi (cir. B.C. 1270). And a clay-tablet in the British Museum informs us that a seal of Tiglath-Ussur, son of Sallimmanu-Ussur, "conqueror of Kar-duniyas," had been carried away, among other spoil, to Babylon six hundred years previous to Sennacherib's capture of that city. Hence we must place the rise of the Semitic rule in Assyria cir. B.C. 1600. It is possible that Bilu-sumili-capi, who, according to "the famous genealogical tablet" (Brit. Mus. Series, p. 35),¹ "established the sove-

¹ This inscription is better known than most of its fellows, having been copied into Bonomi's popular work on *Nineveh and its Palaces*, p. 339. Only the first twenty-two lines, however, are to be found there, and the portion containing the name of Bilu-sumili-capi must be looked for in the British Museum series of cuneiform inscriptions, pl. 35. A translation of the text may not be unacceptable:—"The palace of Rim-zallus, the great king, the powerful king, the mighty king, king of Assyria, the king whom among his people Assur king of the two worlds has built up, while the reguli of Lasanân have filled up his army. From the great sea of the rising sun to the great sea of the setting sun has his hand conquered and subdued, and prevailed over the whole of it. Son of Samas-Rim, the great king, the powerful king, the mighty king, king of Assyria, king of Lasanân, the son of Shalmaneser, king of Kiprat-Arbat, who laid his yoke upon the lands hostile to himself, and swept them like a heap of corn. The grandson of Assur-izir-pal, the hero-priest, the enlarger of the wide-spread kingdom (?) [of] Rim-zallus, the illustrious prince, whom Assur, Samas, Rim, and Merodach have brought help unto, and have enlarged his land. Offspring of the grandson of Tiglath-Ussur, king of Assyria, king of Sumihri and

reignty" of the Semitic Assyrian empire, was the leader of the new dynasty. Bion and Polyhistôr place the extinction of the race of Ninus under Bêleus (Belochus), whose successor Belleparês or Beletaras (*Agath.*, ii., 25) was the founder of the royal line which ended with Sardanapalus. The common account, however, taken from Ktésias, makes Beletaras the son of Belochus and Semiramis. Now Semiramis in Greek writers was the eponyme of the Semitic colonists in Babylon and Nineveh. And either Belochus or Belleparês may be easily compared with Bilu-sumili-capi. Thallus further (ap. Theoph. ad Ant., 281) declares the date of Belus, the founder of the (Semitic) Assyrian power, to have been three hundred and twenty-two years* before the destruction of Troy, *i.e.*, B.C. 1551 or 1506, according as the chronology of Hellanikus or of Eratosthenês was followed.

The Semitic conquest of Babylonia by the Casdim happened, as I have before endeavoured to shew, a little later. The forty-five "Assyrian" kings who, according to Bêrôsus (ap. Euseb., *Armen. Chron.*, p. 39), headed by "Semiramis" (*i.e.*, Khammurabi), reigned over the Chaldeans for 526 years (Hêrodotus, i. 95, roughly puts it down at 520 years), date from 1273 B.C. For four or five centuries previously the Semites had been steadily making way and pushing the Turanians back into the mountains of Elam. Dr. Chwolson brings together various traditions which remind us of important movements and desperate struggles in the far East in the sixteenth century B.C.—the inhabitants of the islands and shores of the Persian Gulf leaving their old homes, and swarming northward to victory and spoil. No doubt they were much aided by the Asiatic campaigns of Totmes I. and his successors in Egypt, which must have weakened the Turanian power in the Euphrates valley. It is possible that the Arabian dynasty of Bêrôsus, the predecessors of the Casdim, were really Semites. As yet, however, we have no proof of this; indeed everything seems to point the other way. Sir H. Rawlinson¹ suggests that they were Aryans: this would antedate the appearance of our race as a world-historical people, but at the same time it would explain a curious phenomenon we meet with in the cuneiform; that is, the possession of Aryan roots as distinct phonetic values by many cuneiform signs. Thus the character which stands for the Semitic *bilu* and the Janban *inu* has also the additional power of *riq* (*rex, rego*, ῥίγω, Goth. *rak-jan*, Sansk. *râj*.) So the Assyrian *tilla* ("high") is made equivalent to the Janban *accad* and the Aryan *urdhu*, with which Sir H. Rawlinson compares the Zend *eredhwa* ("arduous") and the *Ortho-korymbantes* of Hêrodotus (iii. 92). Now, in the Assyrian inscriptions,

Accad: grandson of Shalmaneser the great king, the powerful king. (Line 23.) Restorer of this temple of *Kharris-Kurra* (the eastern fortress) and of the *brick-work thrones* (?) of Bilu-sumili-capi, an ancient king who went before me, the establisher of the sovereignty of our family, of which from remote times Assur has glorified the splendour."

* Lactantius (*Epit. Div. Inst.*) quotes it as being 222 years.

¹ *Athenæum*, Aug. 22nd, 1868, p. 244.

Urardhi (ἡρῶν) is often interchanged with *nirbi* (or *nirib*) *sa Bitani*, "the highlands of Bitan" or Armenia.* An explanation, therefore, of the name *Ararat* is thus afforded, as well as a proof of the Aryan affinities of its inhabitants.† This is further confirmed by the inscriptions found at Van and elsewhere, the grammar and vocabulary of which are markedly Aryan. The genitive plural of nouns, for instance, ends in *-nām*,‡ and most nominatives and genitives singular in *-s*. The verbal augment, again, is very noticeable; *e. g.*, in the Palou inscription *icurun* (comp. *ἔροισιν*), the Sansk. *akaravam*, from the root *kri*, *creo*, *cerus*, *κραινω*, Arm. *kert-el*. The royal names from Van are easily resolved into Aryan elements. Minuas, for example, is exactly *Mivus*, the German *Mannus*, the eponyme of the Western Aryans. They were the "men,"§ the aristocracy of Orkhomenus and Lémnos (Hérod., i. 146; iv. 145, 146; *Il.*, ii. 511, *Od.*, xi. 283), the sons of Jasôn¶ and the Argonauts. The Mannai (the מן of Jer. li. 27), an Aryan folk who dwelt between Armenia and the Medes, are frequently mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions. They seem to have been an offshoot of the Medes, whom we find engaged in fierce contests with some of the earliest-known monarchs of Assyria. They were divided into a multiplicity of small townships, each under the government of its own "magistrate." Even at this early period, therefore, the independent spirit of the Aryan race shews itself—that characteristic hatred of control which split up Greece and Latium into so many jarring polities. Naturally, from their close proximity, the Assyrians and their northern neighbours borrowed many words one from the other. The Italian *mándola*, the Spanish *pandero*, owe their origin to the Assyrian *πανδοῦρα* (Pollux, iv. 60). In the same way *dannu* ("powerful"), a title commonly assumed by the Ninevite kings, can be traced back to Armenia. It appears among the titles of the Vannic prince Riduris, and its relationship to *δύναμις*, Pers.

* Essar-haddon, in his cylinder-inscription, tells us that the inhabitants of Tel-Assur called that country "in their own language by the name of Mikran Pitan." This Mr. F. Talbot compares with *μακρὸν πῆλον*.

† *'Aquría* is the Semitic nomenclature—מדין "the mountain-land of the Minni."

‡ The genitive plural of the first four classes of nouns in Sanskrit ends in *-nām*. The nasal seems to have taken the place of an original guttural-sibilant (=Latin *r*), traces of which are still found in the genitive-plurals of the Sanskrit personal pronouns.

§ The root is *man* ("to think"), whence Sansk. *manu*, *manuja*, *manuschya*, etc., Goth. *manniska*, Germ. *mensch*. *Mévos*, *Minerva*, etc., come from the same root. The Egyptian *Menes* ("the founder") has of course no connection with it, but is a *nomen agentis* from *men*, "ponere."

¶ Jasôn, "the emigrant," another form of *ιαῶν* (ἴων), the general name of the Greeks in the East (Schol. ad Arist. Akharn., 106), from the root *ya* ("ire") like *Iô*, "the wretched wanderer" (*Æskh. Prom.*, v., 608, Dind.) Cyprus in Assyrian inscriptions is called *Pavnan*, the country "of the Iônians," the *Iununi* of Kâthâmî, and the Brahmin settlers in Cambodia are still named *Javana*. *Jasonius Mons* is a mountain-chain in Matiana, the home of the Medes.

‡ *Ri-duris*=*Pea-ḫupos*. The name of the goddess *Ri* or *Rhea* (replaced by *Istar* in Assyrian) seems to have been adopted by the Western Aryans from

tanu, Arm. *atean*, Indian *देवता* (ap. Et. Mag.), is at once manifest. The Homeric *Δαναοί*, the watchword of the soldiery, can far more easily be connected with this word than with Professor Max Müller's *Δαναή*, "dry earth." The Danai evidently bear the same name as the Dayanai or inhabitants of Dayan, which Sir H. Rawlinson at one time endeavoured to identify with Cilicia. They were under the rule of Tsieni in the time of Tiglath-Pileser I., in whose annals any notice of them is first met with. The Daanau of the hieroglyphics, who, like the Dayanai, are associated with the Mashawasha or Moschi (the cuneiform Musak 𐎢𐎠𐎶), are the same people. Dr. Hincks would have them to be the Daai' or Dahæ (*Virg. Æn.*, viii. 728, Pomp., *Mel.*, i. 2, 5, etc.), whose chieftain Maniya (Manes, "the man") was conquered by Tiglath-Pileser II. But this lacks sufficient proof.

It only remains to point out what light the cuneiform monuments throw upon the era of the Aryan migrations toward the west. As early as the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I., the first monarch that has left us chronicles of his campaigns, we find the Aryan Moschi and Tibarêni (*Tuplai*, 𐎢𐎠) in possession of the north-east portion of Asia Minor. The king says:—"In the beginning of my reign twenty thousand of the Moschi, and their five kings, who for fifty years had held the countries of Alzi and Purukhuzi, . . . and whom a king of Assyria had never ventured to meet in battle, . . . came down and seized the land of Kummukh" (Comagene). So that the Aryans had been settled upon the shores of the Euxine at least fifty years previous to B.C. 1120. And this date is extended by the Egyptian inscriptions, which represent Ramses III. as fighting against the allied forces of the Pulsata (Philistines), Tok-karu (Karians), and Khairêtana ("Cherethites" or Krêtans) B.C. 1200. The Philistines, "the remnant of the isle of Caphtor" (Cyprus or Krête), spoke a non-Semitic language (Neh. xiii. 24), and their name seems to combine the first element of *Πελαγοί* with *sata* (*θῆτες*) "the settlers" (from the Sanskrit root *stha*, like the Anglo-Saxon *sætas* in "Somerset" and "Dorset"). According to Stephanus, the whole coast of Palestine was anciently called *Iōnia*, Gaza being known as *Minôa*.² We must, therefore, allow for this extension of the Aryan race to the West. This will make more probable the conjecture noticed above, that the "Arabian"

their Turanian neighbours. Considering that the Vannic *-is*—Greek *-os*, the royal name *Iepuinis* will be in Greek *εἰφοῖνος* or *εἰπρινος*.

² According to the grammarians *Δδος* (*Davus*) in Phrygian—*λύκος*.

³ *Manis* in Phrygian—"a hero" (see Plut. de Isid. et Osir., p. 360 B.). This Aryan root is found even in the cuneiform. The character meaning "king" (*sarru* in Assyrian, *nis* in Janban), has also the value of *man*, the Aryan vocalisation of the same idea.

⁴ *Achish*, king of Gath, *Ἀχίς* in the Septuagint, has been compared by Hitzig (*Urgesch.*, p. 80 f.) with *Ἀχχίλως*; and *Ashdod* (*Atzdudi* in the cuneiform) is evidently *asru*, O. H. G. *wist*, from Sansk. *vas* ("habitare"). *Askalon* (comp. *Asculum*), according to Xanthus, owed its origin to Askalus the general of Akiamps, king of the Lydians, or typical Asiatic Aryans (cfer. *Æsch. Pers.* 41-3). *Dagon* seems to connect itself with *Δικταίος* or *Dichtimus* (from *δύειν* *jacere*), the Krêtan Zeus.

dynasty of Bêrôsus was Aryan. As for the fancy that Mabog, the Syrian name of Hierapolis or Bambykê, is drawn from the Aryan *ma* or *mata* ("mater") and *baga* ("deus"), it is without a tittle of evidence. Were it a fact, the name of the old Janban prince Cuduri-Mabug ("soldier" or "servant" of Mabog"), "the citizen of the West," would thrust back the Aryan emigration to a far earlier epoch than ethnology warrants. Both the name and legend of the king, however, are Turanian, and only afford an additional proof of the primitive Turanian domination in Western Asia. In his days, at all events the Semites had not advanced so far northward as Casius Mons and the sources of the Orontes.

P.S. The following passage of Pliny (vii. 57) may be added to what I said in my last paper in reference to Cyprus:—"Tegulas invenit Cinyra Agrippæ filius, *et metalla æris*, utrumque in insulâ Cypro: item forcipem, martulum, vectem, incudem."

Bath.

A. SAYCE.

UPON THE NECESSITY OF CAUTIOUSNESS IN CRITICISM.

MANY false steps may be taken in life which can be retraced; and many which cannot be retraced may prove injurious only to the characters and prospects of the individuals who have thoughtlessly or rashly taken them. But a false step taken, an error committed, which cannot be amended, which inflicts injury upon *others*, and which is calculated to inflict injury upon others to an indefinite period of time, is a matter to be deeply deplored, and it ought to make all persons wary and circumspect lest they should be instruments of evil to the generation in which they live, and to the generations which follow.

Who shall enumerate the various ways in which individuals lacking prudence and foresight may inflict irreparable injury upon their fellow-creatures? And of all the ills which designedly, undesignedly, or incautiously, man can do to his fellow-man,—*moral* ill, spiritual ill, is the worst. If a brother is damaged by a brother in his body, in his reputation, in his prospects, or in his property, an injury is indeed done to him, but it is possible to repair it by suitable compensation: but no compensation can be made for injury done to a brother's soul. Damage *that*, you destroy the man. You may afterwards grieve over your incautious act; you may weep rivers of tears, as long as you live; but you have inflicted a deadly wound in his vital part which it is not in your power to heal. It may be you have destroyed the man for time and for eternity. There is no doubt that a vast amount of moral and spiritual ill is done by man to man, by evil example and by evil communications: but another means by which man injures his brother is through the *press*: and never, in any age of the world, has the printing-press been so perverted and

misused as a gigantic machine for ill to the moral and spiritual part of man, as it is in the present day.

It is not the object of this paper to enter into this wide and almost illimitable subject. The many streams of immoral and sceptical literature which flow forth perennially from this source, poisoning the districts which they reach, it is truly awful to contemplate. But it is not these alone which are calculated to inflict wide-spread evil upon the masses of the people. The more polite literature of the day, and the literature which touches upon *religion*, is doing also, in many instances, its proportionable amount of injury to the different classes of society.

What false steps have been taken, what lamentable errors have been committed, by persons hastily and unadvisedly rushing into print. Doubtless many individuals of great literary abilities, who have written to please the multitude with the light style of literature of the day, have lived to regret the sentiments which they have published to the world; and if they had it in their power, would gladly commit to the flames many of their early productions, which maturer years, riper faculties, growing wisdom, and changed views, have led them to see the folly of; if not their deeply injurious tendency.

We can easily conceive how great the temptation must be for a person possessed of extraordinary powers of imagery, and great facility of diction and description, to sit down and commit to paper the pictures which the mind delineates, and the sentimental ideas which it creates. We can imagine the large amount of self-denial which it would require for such an one calmly and deliberately to allow the pen to remain dry in the inkstand, or the inkstand itself to be empty, and resolutely and systematically to screw down the floodgates of thought, and to close up every chink and crevice whence the pent-up powers of imagination, and of sentimentality, and of carnalism, might get vent.

On the other hand, we have no doubt that it is a great relief, a great source of gratification, to a mind pregnant with matter of this undesirable description, and having passing before it a perpetual picture of illustration, to unburthen itself by writing, and to describe on paper what is so vividly presented before it. Nevertheless, it would have been far happier for many if they had braced themselves up manfully to have practised the former, rather than have indulged the latter; since the one would have been a cross to bear only for a *time*, whilst the other has proved perhaps to be a source of sorrow and vexation for a whole life.

It is then most unwise for such persons to put forth their thoughts in print, even when the subjects they write upon are of a secular character. But when the subject is *divine*, when the deep things of God are those which are selected as the matter for critical investigation, how cautious, how awe-stricken, ought individuals to be, lest by their profane touch, their presumptuous and flippant remarks, their ill-judged and incautious comments, they should induce any to under-

value essential truth; or lead them astray into vital error. How good would it have been for many endued with extraordinary powers of intellect, and distinguished for great originality of thought, and have brought those gifts to bear upon the Scriptures of truth, if they had been men of ordinary capacities. Conscious talent has intoxicated such persons. Their current of thought, habitually flowing in a channel of its own, and claiming for itself a singular excellency, has inflated the possessors with a degree of arrogance which acknowledges few equals; and it has resulted in that worst form of idolatry,—the idolizing of self.

How has that divine book, the Word of the living God, been *rudely* and *roughly* handled by persons puffed up with the most exalted idea of their own intellectual powers. *Their* refined and almost superhuman minds have discovered *childish defects, absurd contradictions, and illogical reasonings*, which are to be attributed to an infantine, undeveloped, and bygone age; and which advanced intellect, and the progress of natural science, can afford to smile upon and treat with contempt. This is all very grand, but plain men of sober minds and common sense, dwarfs though they be in intellect, can look upon these self-idolizing giants with a feeling of pity; and can often detect in them a lamentable shallowness of spiritual perception, and contractedness of mental grasp: *defects* which commoner, and certainly far less sufficient minds, do not labour under.

Let man sport himself in the field of physical science as much as he pleases. His theories of *to-day* may afford ample scope for innocent speculation; and if they are found to be blunders *to-morrow*, no harm is done. But when man brings his unsanctified reasonings to bear upon revelation and essential truth, and he starts theories, alleges contradictions, which are subversive of the divine authority which it claims, and upon which it takes its stand, then he does harm. He causes the sceptical to chuckle, and confirms still more the doubts of the doubter. Oh! the rashness of the man of thought, rushing hastily into print, and promulgating views which he may afterwards live to regret. We know of one who ventured to assail the orthodox view of the *inspiration* of Scripture: and what was the result? Within the space of two or three years he was enlightened to see his error, and in the most noble and manly manner confessed it; and published his recantation. But he can never repair the damage he may have done to many, in hastily publishing his former erroneous sentiments.

I cannot conceive anything more calculated to depress a conscientious man's spirit, to make him go on his future way with sadness and sorrow marked on his brow, than his having published his hasty opinions, because at the time he thought they were clever and original: and then to live to see the day when he would give all he possesses to recall and suppress them. But this he cannot do. The evil he has done he cannot repair; and the evil which he will indirectly *still* do he cannot counteract. He has forged a weapon for the evil one which *he* will never let go; but will use it in a way per-

haps, and to an extent, which the day of judgment alone will be able to disclose.

Then again as regards the apparent contradictions of God's Word, how imprudent, how rash, ever to *hint* or *imply* that any one such is irreconcilable; when so many instances have occurred wherein passages of Scripture, apparently contradictory, and which have been viewed for ages by some as incapable of being harmonized, have been harmonized, through fresh light having been thrown upon them: and the result has been, additional and corroborative evidence of the inspiration of the Divine volume. "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." *All* should attend to this injunction, and especially persons gifted with rare intellectual talents, when they are about to approach the Word of God.

It is a solemn command uttered by Jehovah on two separate occasions, equally momentous and affecting. What a check against rashness and thoughtless presumption; applicable to man in all ages whenever he approaches Deity, or would examine that which is divine.

What awful reflections are the following for the death-bed of many an author who has been rash and reckless in publishing his heterodox or semi-infidel sentiments:—How many *infidels* have I confirmed in their infidelity by the opinions which I have advanced, and by the statements which I have made? How many sceptics have I been the means of emboldening to take the last fatal plunge into the depths of infidelity? How many enquiring spirits have I led astray from the groove of orthodoxy? How many weak minds, weak in faith, have I succeeded in making unhappy? I see now myself the errors which I had fallen into, and which I now feel to be *fatal* errors; and whenever I strive to quiet my conscience by the reflection, "I could not help the range of thought which my mind took," *conscience* ever makes the discomfiting, nay, the torturing response, "This is true: you could not help the erroneous views which were continually floating in your mind; *but* you *could* have helped rushing into print, and publishing them to the world: stereotyping *that* which you would now give a kingdom, if you possessed one, to efface—to destroy."

Oh! the reckless haste with which many persons endued with great intellectual powers and originality of thought (*but* without spiritual enlightenment) have published their baneful sentiments; and thus for the *few days'* gratification of indulging a morbid intellect, and of gaining the applause of a class (when maturer thought and spiritual teaching have led them to discover their error), they have had to pass through *years* of mental distress, arising from the oft-recurring reflection, that they have damaged the cause of truth generally, and injured individual souls in particular.

It is also to be regretted that there are instances wherein some of our great scholars, spiritual men, and of undoubted orthodoxy, have expressed themselves somewhat unadvisedly, when commenting upon the *discrepancies* of Scripture, apparently irreconcilable. Injury to the cause of truth sometimes results from this. Satanic eyes will

specially scrutinize every word published by good men, and holding the truth; and will try to twist and pervert every unguarded expression, to further their own evil ends. The more orthodox and the more spiritual the intellectual man may be, *his* opinions, above all others, they will sift and examine; and if they can quote a sentiment or an expression which such an one has put forth in support of their own views, or at all events to prove, as they hope to do, the absurdity and the untenableness of some of the abstract doctrines of orthodoxy, they will, in some sort, be strengthening their own *cause*, whilst in the same proportion they will succeed in weakening the cause of truth.

Perhaps I may be permitted to illustrate my meaning by transcribing Dean Alford's note upon the following portion of Scripture. "Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand" (1 Cor. x. 8). Dean Alford comments upon this passage thus:—"The number was twenty-four thousand (Numb. xxv. 9), and is probably set down here from memory. The subtilties of commentators, in order to escape the inference, are discreditable alike to themselves and the cause of sacred truth. Of the principal ancient commentators, Chrysostom and Theophylact do not notice the discrepancy: Œcumenius notices it, and says some ancient copies read *εικοστέσσαρες*, here; but passes it without comment."

It is to be regretted that Dean Alford has thus given expression to his views. He first of all gives it as his opinion that there is a *discrepancy* between Moses and St. Paul which is *irreconcilable*; and, according to his wont, he is rather harsh in his utterances towards those who have tried to harmonize the apparent disagreement between the two statements. I have no doubt that the rationalist would rejoice to see the very low estimate he puts upon his humbler brethren's talents who have tried to harmonize what is apparently contradictory. But to pass this over, the way in which the Dean himself would account for this discrepancy (as *he* thinks) between Moses and St. Paul does give offence, because it seems to sap the very foundation of the plenary inspiration of the Word of God.

"The number was twenty-four thousand (Numb. xxv. 9), and is probably set down here from memory." What are we to understand by this? Clearly, that the Apostle, setting down the number from memory, made a *mistake*.

If St. Paul made a mistake in *this* instance, he may have made a mistake in *other* instances. How are we, then, to rely upon him as an infallible guide? Is the 1 Cor. x. 8, Scripture? "*All Scripture* is given by inspiration of God!" Then Paul was *inspired* when he wrote this Scripture. The Dean says that he *differs* from Moses. *He* accounts for the discrepancy thus, "probably the number is set down from memory;" and, probably, setting down from memory, the Apostle made a *mistake*! Either, then, the 1 Cor. x. 8 is *not* Scripture; or, when St. Paul wrote it, he was *not inspired*.

I have no doubt this statement and the inference to be drawn

from it would *comfort* the Rationalist; but it *wounds* the Christian. The former would *rejoice* at these (as *he* would view them) little sappings of the sacred edifice; but the latter *grieves*, because whilst he knows that nothing can *really* injure God's building, nothing can really damage God's Word, yet *some* may be led by such an expressed opinion, and coming from such an authority, to form low views of portions of it, and *others* to lose their confidence in it altogether. Powerful minds may pity my weakness as an individual, but I confess it would materially detract from my confidence in St. Paul, as an inspired writer, if I believed that he had set down here from *memory*, and consequently had made a *mistake*. I certainly should feel that I was sailing in a vessel in the broad ocean without a chart, without a compass, and without a helm.

"The number is probably set down here from memory!" If it is I am staggered, as this verse is a part of the Word of God. But I do not believe that the Apostle did set down from memory; nay, more (am I presumptuous in saying so?) I am confident he did *not*. I believe that he made this statement as an *inspired* man, and that what he has stated is *true*, perfectly in harmony with Moses' declaration, and that there is no disagreement between these two inspired men.

Notwithstanding Dean Alford has said, "*the subtleties* of commentators, in order to escape the inference, are discreditable alike to themselves and to the cause of sacred truth," we may make an attempt to prove that there is no *contradiction* between what Moses has declared and what Paul has stated. I am no commentator, but an obscure reader of God's blessed Word, and therefore am too insignificant to come under the Dean's lash; but as the method by which I shall attempt to harmonise the apparently discordant statements of these two inspired men is made in great humility, and feeling I can do no great harm, and shall not bring discredit upon sacred truth by my feeble attempt, I submit it; and if I do not succeed, critics, generous critics, will I am sure deal gently with me, and appreciate my effort made in the cause of truth, though they pronounce it to be a failure.

MOSES.—Numbers xxv. 9. "And those that died in the plague were *twenty and four thousand*." PAUL.—1 Cor. x. 8. "Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day *three and twenty thousand*."

In the narrative in Numbers the persons who were destroyed are classed under three heads. I am perfectly aware there are those who will dispute this, giving it as their opinion that the persons who were destroyed can be classed under *two* heads, or under *one* head only (the whole number who were put to death being comprehended in the twenty-four thousand), but as the opposite opinion can be supported by fair argumentation, I shall class them under *three* heads.

1. Those who were hung up.—Verse 4. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Take all the heads of the people, and hang them up before the Lord against the sun."

2. Those who were slain.—Verse 5. “And Moses said unto the judges of Israel, Slay ye every one his men that were joined to Baal-peor.”

3. Those who died in the plague.—Verse 9. “And those that died in the plague were twenty and four thousand.”

Let us notice, then, that those who died in the plague were twenty and four thousand. These *added* to “the heads of the people who were *hung up*,” and “to those *who were slain*,” may have made the full numbers who were destroyed twenty-eight, twenty-nine, or thirty thousand. Now Paul states that twenty-three thousand fell in *one day*; and might not this have been the case? Twenty-three thousand fell in *one day*, and out of how many? It might have been, I repeat, out of twenty-eight or thirty thousand, or even more. If Moses had stated that twenty-four thousand were destroyed *altogether*, without having added “in the plague,” and had PAUL also declared that twenty-three thousand perished without adding “in *one day*,” a discrepancy there would have been which, if reconciled, must have been reconciled in some other way; but as the numbers stand in each statement, Moses saying that twenty-four thousand perished in the *plague alone*, not including those who perished by other means, and Paul saying that twenty-three thousand fell in *one day* out of the *whole number* which perished, there is no necessary discrepancy between their statements. There is *no specified limit* to Moses’ numbers, nor to the *time* when they perished. There *is* a limit to Paul’s numbers, and a *limit* also to the *time* in which they fell.

Moses’ numbers might have been thirty thousand or more, and their *fall* spread over *many* days. Paul’s numbers are a *specified portion* of Moses’ numbers confined to *one day*. Paul’s twenty-three thousand slain “in *one day*” might have been made up of *two* or of the whole *three* of the *three* classes who were slain; i.e., his twenty-three thousand which fell in *one day* might have consisted of a *portion* of those who “died in the plague” and a portion of those who were slain, or of a *portion* of those who “died in the plague,” and of those who were slain, and of those who were *hung up*.

Let me illustrate my meaning thus:—A fortress is besieged. The siege lasts for several days. It is stormed at last and is taken. A messenger is sent home by the besieging party to report their success. The report is, 1st, that numbers were destroyed in making sorties from the fortress; 2nd, that numbers also were slain in the final assault; 3rd, that twenty-four thousand were killed during the two or three days’ bombardment. A second messenger arrives who reports that twenty-three thousand fell in *one day*.

Is there, I ask, any necessary *contradiction* between these two messengers’ reports? Certainly not. It is quite true that *twenty-four thousand* fell from the *constant shelling* of the place; and it is equally true that twenty-three thousand fell in *one day*: that day might have been the *first*, *second*, or *last* day of the siege; and the twenty-three thousand who fell in that *one day* might have consisted of persons who were slain by the cannonading from the ships on that

particular day in conjunction with those who were slain in sorties, or in *conjunction* with those who were slain in sorties and those who were slain in the final assault.

The *first* messenger specifies that twenty-four thousand were slain in a *particular* manner, in an *undefined period of time*. The *second* messenger declares that twenty-three thousand were slain in *no particular manner*, but in a *defined period of time*. There is no *contradiction* here, but perfect *consistency*, perfect *accordance*, in their different accounts. In much humility and diffidence I offer this simple solution of an *apparent* difficulty; but if there are those who can see a defect in this attempt to reconcile what at first sight appears to be discordant, there is no harm done in the attempt being made, no injury, I repeat, to essential truth, no wound inflicted upon people's minds, and no additional arrow put into the quiver of the enemy.

These are days when we must not only resolutely contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, but when we must be alive and awake to every printed opinion which may tend to lower the plenary inspiration of that holy book in which we have the truth enshrined. The Bible is the Word of God: approach it as such with feelings of the deepest reverence and holy awe. Read it, reflect upon it, and comment upon it as the *Word of God*. But impute not what may appear to *some* minds to be errors and mistakes in it to the defects which are to be found in *ordinary* men, but which are *not* to be found in men writing under the *special inspiration of the Holy Ghost*.

If there are difficulties here and there in the Scriptures which have not met with a satisfactory solution, or *discrepancies* which have not quite been satisfactorily *harmonized*, let us be content to wait till some new light is thrown upon them; but let none of us ever utter a sentiment, and especially let those who are *distinguished authors* never set forth in *print* a single word, which may lower in the estimation of some the exalted position of *inspired men*, or of that Divine book of which they are the *amanuenses*.

Let those who have ability, enter as deeply as they can into *Scriptural criticism*, but then let them do it with a humble and teachable mind, a chastened and sanctified spirit; and let them especially avoid using an expression or promulgating a sentiment which may wound the faithful, and which may be used as a weapon against the essentials of a written revelation by the enemies of truth.

W. B. COXWELL ROGERS.

Dowdeswell Rectory, Gloucestershire.

ON THE LAST PASSOVER.

IN the last Number of *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, pp. 457-9, I ventured to offer some objections to the commonly-received opinion, that in the year of our Lord's crucifixion the Jews as well as our

Lord observed Nisan 14, or the passover-day, on the *Thursday*. But there is another objection which requires separate consideration: it is this.

St. Luke (Acts ii. 1) connects the first effusion of the Holy Spirit, and the immediate conversion of three thousand souls by means of Peter's sermon, with the day of Pentecost. But if Nisan 14 fell on a *Thursday*, then Nisan 16—the day of presenting the wave-sheaf as the first-fruits of the barley harvest—fell on a *Saturday*; and then the Pentecost—or the fiftieth day from Nisan 16 inclusive—fell likewise on a *Saturday*. Whereas the Christian Church from the earliest times has commemorated the great Pentecostal events on a *Sunday*.

This difficulty has been dealt with in various ways:—

(1). Some, with Barradius, assert, that if Nisan 16 fell on a *Saturday*, the green ears for the wave-sheaf could not lawfully be reaped on that day, and that the ceremonies, and consequently the Pentecost, would be postponed a day. But Maimonides asserts the contrary: "*Manipulum aristarum ferebant decimo sexto die Nisan, sive dies ille communis sive sabbatum foret.*" See also Matt. xii. 5; John vii. 22, 23.

(2). Others interpret Acts ii. 1 to mean, that the day of Pentecost was "completed," or "fully gone." But such an interpretation is not to be thought of: the Greek will not bear it. Besides, St. Luke's narrative shews that Divine Providence purposely chose the day of Pentecost for the display of his, "great marvels," because so many Jews would be then assembled at Jerusalem from all parts of the world, who would afterwards disperse the tidings of what they had witnessed far and wide. Moreover, as the first-fruits of the barley harvest on Nisan 16 were a type of the resurrection of Christ "the first-fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv. 20, 23); so the first-fruits of the wheat harvest presented at the Pentecost were a type of the three thousand souls who were the first-fruits of the harvest to result from the death of Christ (see his own words, John xii. 24; also Rom. viii. 23; xvi. 5; James i. 18); and Divine Providence evidently intended to mark by the synchronism the connection between the type and the antitype.

(3). Others say, that the early Church shifted the commemoration of the great Pentecostal events in honour of our Lord from the Jewish sabbath to the Lord's day, the fiftieth from his resurrection "as the first-fruits of them that slept." But there is not the slightest evidence that the early Church ever did any such thing; and we must not invent facts to get out of a difficulty.

(4). But Lightfoot and Jennings, after Ribera, deal with the difficulty in another way: they assert that the Pentecost was computed from Nisan 16 *exclusive*, and quote R. Solomon Jarchi, Maimonides, and *Megillath Taanith* (i. e., "a treatise on fasting"), as their authority for such an assertion. I find, however, on examina-

* *De Sacrificiis Jugibus*, cap. vii., § 11, printed in the *Fasciculi* of Crenius, alias Crusius, 8vo, 10 vols. Roterod. 1696: vol. vi., p. 472. Cf. p. 470.

tion, that they have misunderstood the Rabbis. It appears from John Meyer's *Tractatus de Temp. Sacris et de Festis Judæorum* (cap. xiii., § 27; Ugolini, tom. i., col. 662), that there was a dispute among the Rabbis, from what part of Nisan 16 the computation of the fifty days should begin. The law told them to "count from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering: seven sabbaths shall be complete" (Lev. xxiii. 15); "begin . . . from such time as thou beginnest to put thy sickle to the corn" (Deut. xvi. 9). The Sadducees and Karaites argued that, as the sheaf was not presented till morning, the reckoning must begin from the morning of Nisan 16: but the Traditionals argued that, as the seven weeks were to be "complete," and the sacred days always ran, like the other Jewish days, "from even to even" (Lev. xxiii. 15, 32), and the law said not בֹּקֶר, in matutino tempore, but עֶרֶב וַחֲדָשׁ, à crastino sabbati, cujus initium est à vespérâ, therefore the computation must begin from the evening of Nisan 16, i. e., the evening which commenced the νυχθημερον Nisan 16, not that which ended the day, as Ribera, Lightfoot, and Jennings mistook the Rabbis to mean.

The following passages are referred to by Jennings (*Jewish Antiquities*, vol. ii., p. 211.) (a) Meyer published the *Megillath Taanith* with a Latin translation and notes, "ad calcem" or as a supplement to his *Tractatus de Festis Judæorum*: 4to. Amstel.: 1724. This *Megillath* says: "Sadducei contendebant Azereth, sive quinquagesimum diem, esse (quotannis) post sabbatum (p. 4). . . Cum verò lex dicit à crastino sabbati, ejus sensus est, à crastino primi diei Festi Paschatis" (p. 6): on which Meyer observes: "Hoc dicebant Sadducei quia scriptum in lege est, Lev. xxiii. 15, 'à crastino sabbathi,' i. e., die Solis, sive die primo post sabbatum hebdomadale. Juxta eam Sadduceorum sententiam semper Azereth sive festum Pentecostes incidit in diem Solis. At vero cum legitur à crastino sabbathi sensus est, à crastino festi Paschatis (non sabbathi hebdomadalis), die 16 Nisan, uti porro sequitur." Here is no statement whatever that the computation was to be from Nisan 16 exclusive. (b) Jennings also refers to Maimonides *De Sacrificiis Jugibus*, cap. vii., § 22, in *Crenii Fasciculo Sext.*, p. 477, mentioned in note, p. 201. Maimonides there says: "Jam præceptum est jubens, ut ab eo die quo feratur manipulus, septem hebdomadæ numerentur integræ. Scriptum est enim, Numerabitis ergo ab altero die sabbati . . . septem hebdomadas. Porro præceptum est etiam, ut cum hebdomadibus numerentur et singuli dies, siquidem in Lege dicitur, Quinquaginta dies. Ac principio diei numerandum est: itaque noctu numerandum ab nocte decimâ sextâ Nisan." Crenius's note here is: "*Principio diei.* Dies hic intelligitur naturalis; qui apud Hebræos incipit ab horâ sextâ vespertinâ, et in eandem horam desinit." That Maimonides meant by "nocte decimâ sextâ Nisan," the night which commenced Nisan 16, see one of the extracts from him in your last Number, p. 451, middle, where "tricesimâ nocte mensis" is followed by, "toto illo die tricesimo nuncii expectabantur." If any doubt could still remain as to Maimonides' meaning in the present case, it will be removed by

a passage of the same treatise *De Sacr. Jugibus* (pp. 471—474), where he states that the green ears were reaped directly the sun of Nisan 15 had set, and offered that same evening. The passage is curious, as shewing the scrupulous care the Jews took to carry out their law to the letter, and to make it patent that they did so; and is too good to be lost: “*Jam hæc erat hujus manipuli parandi ratio. De vigiliâ solemnitate emittebantur à Senatu qui fruges terræ solo inhærentes colligarent in fasciculos, quo facilius meterentur. Ac conveniebant eò proxima quæque oppida, quo messis ista majorem haberet celebritatem. Metebant igitur tria sata hordei homines tres tribus falcibus, et arcis imponebant tribus. Cum primum advesperasceret, messorum unus omnes astantes ita rogabat. Jam occubuit Sol? et respondebant ei; Sic est. Haecine falsæ messoria? Respondebant ei, Sic est. Haecine arca? Respondebant ei, Sic est. Quod si sabbatum esset, idem rogabat, Estne sabbatum hodie? et respondebant ei, Est. Tum deinde rogabat, Metamne? et illi respondebant, Mete. Atque harum rogationum et responsionum unaquæque ter repetebatur. Quorsum igitur hæc tam multa? Ad refellendos heterodoxos illos qui stante Templo secundo à communione Judæorum recedentes Legis illud *Altero die sabbati* (Lev. xxiii. 15) pertinere ad *sabbatum Geneseos* pugnabant. . . § 12. Quod cum esset demessum, imponebatur arcis, atque in atrium ferebatur. Hic excutiebatur ac ventilando mundabatur, tum excussa illa grana hordeacea igni torrebantur in sartagine perforatâ adeo, ut ignis omnia invaderet, quia scriptum est *De spiciis adhuc virentibus torrebis igni, et confringes in morem farri* (Lev. ii. 14): quo loco agi de solo munere manipuli perpetuâ traditione acceperunt alii ab aliis. Expansa deinde in atrio perflabat ventus: confringebantur inde molâ molendinariâ: atque ex his tribus satis contractis *decimam* similaginis succernebant cribris tredecim: reliquum pretio redimebatur, et promiscuè comedeatur ab omnibus. Atque eodem illo die sexto decimo Nisan *decimam istam* similaginis hordeaceæ . . . agitabant: . . . tum ex eâ sacerdos plenum pugillum depromebat, atque adolebat: reliquum autem comedeatur à sacerdotibus itidem ut cunctorum fertorum reliquiæ. Sed quo diei tempore depromebatur plenus ille pugillus? Nempe postquam factum erat et sacrificium quod eo die ceteris addebatur, et holocaustum ex agno, qui cum manipulo mactabatur ante sacrificium jure vespertinum.” Thus Deut. xvi. 9 was strictly complied with, and the whole of Nisan 16 was included in the fifty days; and Maimonides is the very last person who should be cited for Nisan 16 *exclusive*. (c) The comment of R. Solomon Jarchi on Lev. xxiii. 15, I cannot meet with; but Hen. Hottinger in a note to Goodwin’s *Moses and Aaron*, cap. xv., refers to R. Solomon, Maimonides, and Abarbanel, as holding that “Nisan 16 fuit primus quinquaginta dierum;” and quotes another Rabbi’s description of the mode of numbering, beginning:—“Post vespertinam benedictionem nocte secundâ ineunte numerum manipuli inchoare solent, etc.,” and the learned Buxtorf, in his *De Synagog. Jud.*, cap. xx., thus writes:—“Numerare incipiunt ab alterâ nocte à Paschate [*i. e.*, from the night after Nisan 15], cum stellarum accessu;*

post peractas preces vespertinas, *decimo sexto* sc. mensis Nisan." And the Targum of Onkelos says the Pentecost was fifty days "post Festum Paschatis," i. e., post Nisan 15. It is quite clear then that Lightfoot and Jennings have misapprehended the meaning of the Rabbis, who undoubtedly computed the Pentecost from Nisan 16 *inclusive*.

I dwell on this matter the more, because I perceive that the error has been reproduced by the learned author of the new *Fasti Sacri*, reviewed in your last Number. Mr. Lewin has been misled by Jennings. But he goes a step further than his authority: he tries to verify his principle by appealing to the well-known case, when a Pentecost is said to have immediately followed a sabbath (Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiii., 8, 4): the event he dates B.C. 130: finding the full moon of March 26 in that year not suit his purpose, he intercalates a month, and takes the full moon of April 24, and in this way gets a Pentecost according to his principle on June 14, a Sunday, or the day after the sabbath. But April 24 is a week too late for the latest limit of the Paschal full moon: Mr. Lewin says (Introduction, p. xl.), what he admirably proves at p. 251:—"The hinge upon which the whole Jewish year turned was the 15th Nisan, which was *always* the day of full moon, about the time of the vernal equinox, when the sun was in Aries, i. e., between 17th March and 17th April." He must not depart from his own rule to prove a particular theory: the intercalary month was designed to keep the Passover within those limits: his test, therefore, fails. The Pentecost in B.C. 130, computed as it should be from Nisan 16 *inclusive*, fell on the day *before* the sabbath; and looking at Josephus's quotation from Nicolaus of Damascus, who mentions a Jewish festival as the objection to marching, we may reasonably conjecture that Josephus was slightly inaccurate, and should have said that the Pentecost in that instance fell on the day *before* the sabbath. But Mr. Greswell (*Dissertations*, vol. ii., p. 287, note) thinks the event happened B.C. 133, in which year the Paschal full moon was on March 28, and Nisan 16 on March 29—a Sunday; the Pentecost, therefore, would likewise fall on a Sunday, or the day *after* the sabbath, which would be a test in favour of computing from Nisan 16 *inclusive*.

The objection, therefore, to the Jews' Thursday Passover, as throwing the Pentecost on a Saturday, and putting the Christian Church in the wrong in commemorating it on a Sunday, remains in full force. Whereas, if we admit that our Lord kept his Nisan 14 on the *Thursday*, as the synoptic gospels represent; and the Jews their Nisan 14 on the *Friday*, as St. John's gospel taken in its natural sense represents that they did, and as the Greek Church believes, with Chrysostom and Cyril, to this day; then—all comes right: Nisan 16 fell on a Sunday, the ascension or fortieth day on a Thursday, and the Pentecost on a Sunday: Acts ii. 1 is not warped from its obvious meaning; the synchronism between the type and the antitype in three important cases is preserved; the discrepancies between the evangelists are not ignored but explained; and the practice of the Christian Church vindicated.

All these good results follow our acceptance of the theory of

double feast days, supposed to be calculated from double new moons or calends. Astronomy connects this theory for a Thursday and Friday Nisan 14 with the year A.D. 29, but with no other from A.D. 25 to A.D. 35,—strong presumptive evidence that the year A.D. 29, and no other, was the year in which our Saviour was crucified. But on this point I hope to say something more on a future occasion.

J. P.

NEW TESTAMENT PARALLELISM.

I FEEL more and more convinced, on every fresh investigation, that Parallelism, taking that term in its widest significance as the principle which regulates the arrangement and consecution of thought in Scripture composition, in prose frequently as well as in verse, is one of the most valuable aids for the interpretation both of the Old and New Testament. Several of the later German commentators have applied it with good effect to the elucidation of the Old Testament; *e. g.*, Drechsler (and especially Hahn on Isaiah xl.—lxvi.) in *Der Prophet Jesaja von D. Moritz Drechsler, fortgesetzt von Franz Delitzsch und August Hahn*, and Bertheau on the Book of Judges and Ruth, in the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch*. Few or none of the Germans, however, seem to have suspected that the same principle of arrangement which had become so familiar to the Hebrew mind, from its general employment by the writers of the Old Testament, might naturally be expected to pervade much of the writings of the New.

I hope soon, by the publication of a Commentary on the Romans, which I have long been maturing on this principle, to shew that parallelism furnishes a key to many of the problems in this difficult epistle. Meanwhile, will you permit me space in your Journal to prepare in part your readers for the reception of what I know to most minds appears a baseless theory, by exhibiting the arrangement of the eleventh chapter of Hebrews—the greater part at least of which epistle I know to be composed according to the principles of parallelism.

HEBREWS XI.

1. *A* Now FAITH is the substance of things *hoped for*.
- B* The evidence of things *not seen*;
2. For by it the elders obtained a good report.

I. B.

3. By FAITH we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God,
So that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.
4. By FAITH Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain,
By which he obtained witness that he was righteous,
God testifying of his gifts;
And by it he being dead yet speaketh.
5. By FAITH Enoch was translated that he should not see death;
And was not found because God had translated him;
For before his translation he had this testimony that he pleased God.
6. But without faith it is impossible to please Him;
For he that cometh to God must believe that He is,
And that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.

7. By FAITH Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet,
 Moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house;
 By the which he condemned the world,
 And became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.
8. By FAITH Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place
 Which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed;
 And he went out, not knowing whither he went.
9. By FAITH he sojourned in the land of promise,
 As in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles,
 With Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise;
10. For he looked for a city which hath foundations,
 Whose builder and maker is God.
11. By FAITH also Sarah herself
 Received strength to conceive seed,
 And was delivered of a child when she was past age,
 Because she judged Him faithful who had promised.
12. Therefore sprang there even of one,
 And him as good as dead,
 So many as the stars of the sky in multitude,
 And as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable.
13. These all died in faith,
 Not having received the promises, [braced them,
 But having seen them afar off, [and were persuaded of them] and em-
 And confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.
14. For they that say such things
 Declare plainly that they seek a country, [came out,
 And truly if they had been mindful of that country from whence they
 They might have had opportunity to have returned.
15. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly.
16. Wherefore God is not ashamed [of them],
 To be called their God;
 For He hath prepared for them a city.
- CENTRAL EXAMPLE.
17. By FAITH Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac:
 And he that had received the promises offered up his only-begotten son;
18. Of whom it was said,
 That in Isaac shall thy seed be called;
19. Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead;
 From whence also he received him in a figure.
- II. 4.
20. By FAITH Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things to come.
21. By FAITH Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph;
 And worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff. [children of Israel;
22. By FAITH Joseph, when he died, made mention of the departing of the
 And gave commandment concerning his bones.
23. By FAITH Moses, when he was born, was hid three months of his parents,
 Because they saw he was a proper child;
 And they were not afraid of the king's commandment.
24. By FAITH Moses, when he was come to years,
 Refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter;

25. Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God,
Than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season ;
26. Esteeming the reproach of Christ
Greater riches than the treasures in Egypt ;
For he had respect unto the recompence of the reward.
27. By FAITH he forsook Egypt,
Not fearing the wrath of the king ;
For he endured, as seeing Him who is invisible.
28. By FAITH he kept the passover,
And the sprinkling of blood,
Lest he that destroyed the first-born should touch them.
By FAITH they passed through the Red Sea as by dry land ;
Which the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned.
30. By FAITH the walls of Jericho fell down,
After they were compassed about seven days.
31. By FAITH the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not,
When she had received the spies with peace.

III.

32. And what shall I more say ?
For the time would fail me to tell
Of Gedeon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae ;
Of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets ;
- (C.) WHAT FAITH ENABLED THOSE OF OLD TIME TO ACCOMPLISH ;
33. Who through faith subdued kingdoms,
Wrought righteousness,
Obtained promises ;
Stopped the mouths of lions,
34. Quenched the violence of fire,
Escaped the edge of the sword ;
Out of weakness were made strong,
Waxed valiant in fight,
Turned to flight the armies of the aliens.
- (D.) WHAT FAITH ENABLED THEM TO ENDURE ;
35. Women received their dead raised to life again ;
And others were tortured,
Not accepting deliverance,
That they might obtain a better resurrection.
36. And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings,
Yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments ;
37. They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted ;
They were slain with the sword.
- They wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins ;
Being destitute, afflicted, tormented ;
38. Of whom the world was not worthy ;
They wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.
39. And these all, having obtained a good report through faith,
Received not the promise :
40. God having provided some better thing for us,
That they without us should not be made perfect.

Verses 1 and 2 state the subject FAITH with its twofold definition :

A, as " the substance of things *hoped for* ;"

B, as " the evidence of things *not seen*."

The order of the illustrations which follow of each definition is reversed as usual, for the purpose of placing the more important topic first and last. In *B* it is the *intellect* that is more concerned, which may be convinced of the reality of "things *not seen*," and yet the man remain inactive. Even "devils *believe*, and tremble." It is the *heart* that "*hopes*" and prompts to action. *A*, therefore, stands first and last.

B, accordingly, first receives its sevenfold illustration (each illustration beginning with *Notes* "By FAITH") in verses 3—12. The general result is then summed up in verses 13—16.

A receives its illustration in verses 20—31; *seven-fold*, if we count the whole paragraph about Moses (which forms the centre of this series, verses 23—28) as one—*ten-fold*, if we count each of the four instances in it, beginning with "By FAITH," separately.

In the middle (verses 17—19), between both series, *A* and *B*, as partaking equally of the character of both, is placed the central instance of FAITH, the greatest ever exhibited by mortal man—Abraham's offering up of Isaac—the *seen* being yielded up for the unseen; the *hope*, realized at length in Isaac his seed, on whose life all the promises seemed suspended, being resigned by the father of the faithful, that he might receive his son back in a higher form as from the dead, and behold in him as a type the seed "in whom all the families of the earth were to be blessed," and "seeing His day might be glad" (John viii. 55).

A concise sketch of the arrangement will make this more apparent.

1. *A*. FAITH is the substance of things *hoped for*.

B. ——— the evidence of things *not seen*.

B.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 3. By faith we understand that the worlds, etc. | } All three before the flood. |
| 4. By faith Abel, etc. | |
| 5. By faith Enoch, etc. | |
| 7. By faith NOAH, etc. | } All three relate to Abraham's history. |
| 8. By faith Abraham, etc. | |
| 9. By faith he sojourned, etc. | |
| 11. By faith also Sarah herself, etc. | |

Verses 13—16 sum up the results of series *B*.

Central Instance.—ABRAHAM OFFERING UP ISAAC:

Verses 17—19. Forming the transition from the realization of "things not seen" to the conviction of "things hoped for."

A.

20. By faith Isaac, etc.
21. By faith Jacob, etc.
22. By faith Joseph, etc.
23. By faith MOSES, etc.
24. By faith MOSES, etc.
27. By faith he forsook Egypt, etc.
28. By faith he kept the Passover, etc.
29. By faith they passed through the Red Sea, etc.
30. By faith the walls of Jericho, etc.
31. By faith the harlot Rahab, etc.

We are not to expect that between the two definitions of faith, *A*

and B, so nearly allied, a strict line of demarcation will be observed in all the instances.

Faith usually leads up to hope, so that in giving instances of faith even in its lower stage as "the conviction of things not seen," the difference between these and those that have reached the higher stage, where hope is predominant, will be one of degree, and not of kind. Again, things cannot be *hoped for* as substantial realities without the previous "conviction of things not seen" as yet. Besides, in Scripture it would be a mistake to suppose that in characterizing two or more cognate subjects by distinctive epithets more peculiarly appropriate to each, it is meant to deny their applicability to the others. Thus, in the benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 14,

"The *grace* of our Lord Jesus Christ,
And the *love* of God,
And the *communion* of the Holy Ghost,
Be with you all. Amen;"

it is by no means meant to affirm *grace* to belong exclusively to our Lord Jesus Christ, or *love* to God, or even *communion* (κοινωνία) to the Holy Ghost, as 1 Cor. i. 9, and 1 John i. 3 prove. So also in the parallelistic arrangement of St. Paul's usual salutation in his Epistles,

"Grace be unto you,
And peace
From God our Father,
And from the Lord Jesus Christ,"

the *grace* is more especially attributed to the Lord Jesus Christ (as in Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Gal. i. 6; vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; Philem. 25; Rev. xxii. 21), and *peace* to God the Father (as in Rom. xv. 23; xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 7, 9; Heb. xiii. 20); but it would be erroneous to conclude that St. Paul did not mean to affirm both qualities as belonging to both Father and Son.

But that ver. 3—16 are intended more especially to illustrate definition B, viz., that "Faith is the evidence of things *not seen*," οὐ βλεπομένων, will appear on observing that several of the examples under this head cannot apply to things "*hoped for*," e.g., "that the worlds were framed by the word of God," (ver. 3,) which was a *past* event, whereas hope always respects the *future*. Besides, there is a direct reference to definition B; "things which are *seen* [now] not being made of things [previously] apparent," εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὸ βλεπόμενον γεγονέναι; in ver. 7 Noah was "warned of things *not seen* as yet," περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων: and it was not *hope*, but "*fear*," that moved him to prepare the ark. True, there must have been hope mingled with his fear, but negative rather than positive,—the hope of escaping *evil* more than of attaining any *good*. And in the summing up of this first series, in ver. 13—16, the allusion is to *sight*, not to *hope*; ver. 13, "not having received the promises, but having *seen* them afar off." In A, on the contrary (ver. 20—31), in every instance Faith regards things *hoped for*, and all therefore are *good*, and things *to come*.

The instances of faith adduced in both series are not taken at random, but are all chosen so as to describe the very case of the Hebrew Christians. These were now in great danger of apostatizing from Christianity to Judaism, being ashamed partly at the taunts thrown out against the simplicity and bareness of the Christian worship compared with the imposing grandeur of the temple, and its splendid ritual services, and partly alarmed by the threats of entire exclusion by their unbelieving countrymen from any participation in these, and from all that hitherto as Jews they had held most dear and sacred, and by the persecution already commenced against them, as the followers of Christ. To encourage them to hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering, by shewing especially that every blessing promised or shadowed forth in the older dispensation, they possessed in a higher and perfected form in Christ, is the great object kept in view in the selection of the instances of faith here adduced.

I. *First Septenary, B.*—Verse 3. As by faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God out of things not apparent, so we recognize by faith the certainty of the promise of a new order of things to be realized, not through Moses, but through Christ, "the world to come whereof we speak" (Heb. ii. 5), and of those "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet. iii. 13).

Verse 4. As by faith the sacrifice of the younger brother, Abel, was more excellent and acceptable than that of the elder brother, Cain, so the sacrifice of the younger church, the Christian—the shedding of the blood of the true Lamb of God—is that by which alone you can obtain the witness that you are truly righteous before God, as being a better sacrifice than that of the elder church, the Jewish, which now, as the elder brother, is seeking the death of the younger, because itself, like Cain, excluded from God's favour, "for God has respect to" the Christian worship, not the Mosaic. But fear not to suffer for the truth like the first martyr; for though dead, ye shall yet speak by testifying your faith in the true sacrifice of which Abel's was but the type. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.

Verse 5. Walk with God, as did Enoch, that you may receive a similar testimony of having pleased God, and your decease shall be no real death, but a translation to heaven and a higher life. Enoch prophesied of the coming flood (Jude 14, 15), and was taken away from the evil coming on a wicked world. So you have been taught by Christ himself to foresee the approaching flood (Matt. xxiv. 38, 39), about to overwhelm the Jewish world. Believe, and ye shall be privileged to escape the coming evil.

Central Verse of First Septenary.—Verse 7. The flood is certainly coming. Warned of God, as was Noah, of things not seen as yet, and moved with fear, prepare a refuge for yourselves in Christ, God's ark, and thereby condemn the Jewish world for its unbelief, and become heirs of the righteousness that is by faith.

Last three Examples of First Septenary.—Verse 8. Like your father

Abraham, fear not to quit your old country for the inheritance promised to you, though you know not distinctly whither you may be led.

Verse 9, 10. But realize your condition as strangers on earth with all your fellow heirs of the same great promise, and instead of an earthly city, look for the heavenly Jerusalem, for a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

Verse 11.—Then shall the Christian church, the free woman, like Sarah, through faith become the mother of a countless seed.

Verse 13—16. Imitate, therefore, that faith of the patriarchs which is “the evidence of things *not seen*,” remembering that they died without having seen fulfilled the promises, yet by the eye of faith “having seen them afar off,” and that they cast no lingering look behind, as if mindful of that country from whence they came out, as some of you seem to be doing, but desired another and better country, even a heavenly one.

CENTRAL EXAMPLE BETWEEN THE TWO SERIES.—Verse 17—19. But in order to attain to the perfection required of you, as the central point of all, you must strive to imitate the highest instance of faith exhibited by your great father Abraham, who when tried offered up Isaac, the outward visible pledge of all God’s promises to him, on whose life their fulfilment seemed wholly to depend. So you are called upon to give up all that has hitherto been nearest and dearest to you, and what appears to you as most intimately bound up with God’s promises, your country, people, temple, sacrifices, worship, to receive all again in a higher form as raised from the dead.

II. *Second Septenary (or Denary) A.*—And now, when once your faith, having become the evident *sight* of things invisible, is prepared to rise into the higher region of assured *hope*, and to rest on its great objects as substantial realities, to this again you are encouraged by the example of those of old time. Realize as truly in hope, as they did, the possession of the blessings promised by God; for they even when dying without their obtaining them themselves, yet so firmly grasped them as to speak of them as things assuredly to come to pass.

Verse 20. As Isaac, who in the assured hope of God’s promises of blessings being fulfilled to Abraham and his seed, pronounced a blessing on Jacob and Esau, but blessed the younger son with the rights of the first-born, forfeited by Esau; so let your faith apprehend that the younger Christian church carries away the higher blessing forfeited by the elder Jewish church, who on this account persecutes and drives away the younger brother.

Verse 21. Or again as Jacob, who when blessing Joseph’s sons, yet pronounced the better blessing on the younger son—reminding them at the same time of God’s wondrous providence in fulfilling all his promises to himself, by leaning in reverential gratitude on that pilgrim staff (ῥαβδόν as it should be pointed in Gen. xlvii. 31 [τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ Septuag.] not ῥαβδόν) with which, as his sole companion, he had once crossed the Jordan, but afterwards had been increased to two bands, and which, no doubt, he retained constantly, as the memorial of his still un-

completed pilgrimage, till it should be ended by his crossing the Jordan waters of death, and entering that better and heavenly country for which he looked,—so cherish a like faith and hope with Jacob of the certain fulfilment of God's promises. Or lastly,

Verse 22. As Joseph, who when dying looked forward with assured faith to the exodus of the children of Israel out of Egypt, and by the orders he gave concerning his bones desired his lot to be joined with the people of God, so cherish like aspirations now that you are entering upon your exodus from among a people laden with heavier judgments than even those of Egypt.

Central Group of Series A.—But especially ponder the lesson taught you by Moses himself, to whose dispensation, now “decaying and waxing old, and ready to vanish away” (Heb. viii. 13), your unbelieving countrymen urge you to return back.

Verse 23. Exercise the faith which led Moses' parents to disregard the command of the king. Fear not the prohibition or threats of those in power, nor betray the precious trust of God committed to your care.

Verse 24—26. Remember that by faith Moses refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, to whom belonged the promise of “the seed in whom all the nations of the earth were to be blessed,” “esteeming the reproach of Christ [a turn of expression used with evident adaptation to the circumstances of the Hebrews] greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.”

Verse 27. By faith Moses left Egypt, disregarding the wrath of man, and looking only to God;

Verse 28. And by faith, observed God's appointed means of escaping the judgments executed by the destroying angel on the first born of Egypt, by keeping the passover and the sprinkling of the blood. The real antitypes of which are now given you for salvation.

Last three Examples of Series A.—Verse 29. Fear not to go forward, whatever dangers threaten. God will make for you, as for his people of old, “a way in the sea and a path in the mighty waters” (Isai. xliii. 16).

Verse 30. “By faith the walls of Jericho fell down.” So the stronghold of your persecutors, the earthly Jerusalem, has now assumed the character, and will soon meet the fate, as it is already under the curse, of the ancient capital of Canaan.

Verse 31. And they only, who like Rahab in the midst of those ripe for judgment, believe the announcement of the coming wrath, shall be saved.

Let me here draw attention to a very interesting feature in the parallelistic arrangements, that the *central* term in them (and particularly in the septenary arrangement) frequently forms the very *heart*, as it were, or animating centre, of the whole subject. Of the seven beatitudes or consecutive graces of the Christian character, the fourth or *central* one, “Hungering and thirsting after righteousness,” forms the most characteristic description that could be given of the true Chris-

tian, painfully conscious of his spiritual wants, and of the wide distance which yet parts between him and the source of all perfection, so that "forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those which are before, he is pressing ever forward for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." In the corresponding petition of the seven in the Lord's prayer, the *concentrated* essence of prayer in the hungering creature coming with all his wants and desires before a throne of grace is, "Give us this day our daily bread," for our whole nature, for "spirit, soul, and body." In the *three-fold* division of the Decalogue (as distinguished from the *two-fold*), the Fifth Commandment, "Honour thy father and mother," stands in the centre, midway between the Commandments, I.—IV. prescribing our duty to God, and VI.—X. prescribing our duty to our neighbour, and connecting us with both; teaching us, with those feelings first inspired by our relation to our earthly parents, to look up to God as our *Father* in heaven, and back again to our neighbour as our *brother* on earth—the very *heart* of the Ten Commandments being thus a requisition of obedience to their injunctions in the spirit of *filial* obedience and love.*

So in the chapter before us, the *central* terms draw the special attention of the Hebrew Christians to the very examples most applicable to their own circumstances. In *B* the case of NOAH formed the transition from the old world to the new. So the Hebrew Christians were now passing from the old to the new dispensation, and must flee to the ark of refuge prepared for them, if they would escape the destruction about to overwhelm the old world.

In *A*, MOSES to whom they desired to return back, and to give their special confidence, is he, as the central arrangement indicates, who specially pointed them to Christ.

But above all, by the prominent place assigned to the offering up of ISAAC by ABRAHAM at God's command, as holding the central point between both series *B* and *A*, verse 17—19, they are pointed, as the high standard after which they should specially strive, to this crowning instance of faith in their great patriarch Abraham, which taught them to give up the seen for the unseen, and to resign at God's demand their past hopes to receive all in a higher form as raised from the dead.

III. After the special instances of faith enlarged on above, there follows in a third supplementary division (almost every whole in Scripture being divided into three) a general reference to the other examples of faith in the Old Testament, with allusion specially to seven, divided into four and three :—

Gedeon, Barak, Samson, and Jephthae ;

David, Samuel, and the prophets ;

and in order to encourage the Hebrew Christians to perseverance, both in *doing* and *suffering*, the writer of the Epistle recounts

1. What Faith enabled those of old time to *accomplish* (ver. 33, 34).

2. What Faith enabled them to *endure* (ver. 35—38).

the whole ending with two verses, 39, 40, summing up the result.

* See *Symmetrical Structure of Scripture; or, The Seven Beatitudes.*

In the first of these divisions (ver. 33, 34) it will be observed that the various acts of faith which the saints of former times were strengthened to perform are systematically arranged into three triplets, the first three describing the *triumphs* which faith enabled them to obtain; the next three their *escapes* from the dangers which they had to encounter; and the last three their *recoveries* from the state of depression and disaster to which they had been reduced, whether by weakness, defeat, or occupation of their land by enemies.

The *constructive parallelism* of the lines by which they are grouped into *threes* is still more apparent in the Greek than in the English:—

κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας,
εἰργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην,
ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιών·
ἐφραξαν στόματα λεόντων,
ἐσβέσαν δύναμιν πυρός,
ἐφύηγον στόματα μαχαίρας·
ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας,
ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ,
παρεμβολὰς ἐκλίναν ἄλλοτρίων.

In the first triplet the verbs are followed by single nouns as their complements, in the second by nouns (the same in the first and last line, *στόματα*) qualified by genitives, while the third differs from both. The second division again (ver. 35—38), consists of three quatrains, or four-lined stanzas.

For other examples of the elucidation of New Testament passages by parallelism, let me refer your readers who are possessed of the previous numbers of *The Journal of Sacred Literature* to a paper on John v. 19—30, contributed by me in October, 1851, and, for the prevalence of the septenary arrangement in the New Testament, to an article from another pen in the same number; to an illustration of the Lord's intercessory prayer in John xvii. in the number for January, 1859; to Bishop Jebb's *Sacred Literature*; to Forbes's *Symmetrical Structure of Scripture*, and an extract from it in a small pamphlet (price 3d.) published by James Taylor, 31, Castle-street, Edinburgh, entitled *The Seven Beatitudes, Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments illustrated by Parallelism*, and to Professor Godwin's *Apocalypse of St. John Metrically Arranged*.

Edinburgh, Jan. 10th, 1866.

JOHN FORBES.

THE *A PRIORI* ARGUMENT OF MR. GILLESPIE, AND ITS TREATMENT BY MR. BARKER.

THE following observations are upon "Lectures on *The Duration of Future Punishments*, by William Barker, Baptist Minister" (preface by C. H. Spurgeon), in so far as the lectures animadvert on *The Argument*

a priori for the *Moral Attributes of God*, by William Honyman Gillespie, author of *The Necessary Existence of God*.

In Mr. Barker's first observations, pp. 53—57, he quite overlooks the important truth that the offence of a finite creature must also be finite, and, consequently, divine justice must be satisfied with the infliction of a finite, that is, *terminable* punishment. *Eternal* torture for a *limited* crime would be the grossest possible injustice.

The existence of the attribute of justice does not postulate objects for *punishment*. This altogether depends upon whether they have committed an offence. Had men and angels remained sinless, God would still have been infinitely and inflexibly just, though there would have been no suffering judicially inflicted in the universe. So, when the suffering has been proportioned to the offence, he may, and in a sense *must*, pardon the offender, who has *paid* "to the uttermost farthing" the penalty of his crime. The judge at "a maiden assize" is quite as much a representative of justice as when the calendar is full.

In Mr. Barker's second observations, pp. 59—66, he seems altogether ignorant of the important truth, the *universal* God is bi-sexual, or, shall we say, all-sexual? that he unites the love of both father and mother, and, we may add, of brother and sister, and all possible relationships, in his regard for his children. In a sense justice is a masculine and love a feminine attribute; but Mr. Barker's eternal hell-fire is a component of an eminently hard, harsh, dry, and masculine scheme, and so tends to undervalue if not to ignore the comparatively feminine attribute of love.

From his observations on Ahriman, etc., etc., it is obvious that Mr. Barker is ignorant of the important truth that good is *positive* and evil is *negative*; that there is nothing in the former antagonistic to its perpetuity, while everything attaching to the latter is self-destructive. He does not seem to understand that God's goodness is a part of his *absolute perfection*, and that this perfection in the Creator implies a corresponding perfection in his creation *when finished*. Now an *eternal hell*, with its Satanic monarch, its torturing fiends, and its tortured souls, would certainly be anything but an instance of *moral* perfection. It would just be so much *chaos*, defying creative power to fashion it into order and beauty.

His observations on God being the only living one *now* shew that he is ignorant of another great truth, namely, that creation is still *in process*, that the work of God is not yet complete, and, we may add, will not be so till all sentient being is rendered happy.

He does not seem to see that the utter "shattering" of Satan's enterprise implies its annihilation. To exist for ever, evil must be effectually *organized*; nay, to exist for any period, or to produce any result, it must be so.

But it would be quite useless to argue the matter on its own merits with such a man as Mr. Barker, who has obviously never thought out such subjects, or dared to examine them down to fundamentals. Like many professed theologians, he is so accustomed to the quotation of

authority, that abstract reasoning is lost upon him. To enable him to fully understand the force of an *à priori* argument, he would need to have his mind reconstituted, or at least *re-educated*.

His whole work is a piece of special pleading in support of a fore-gone conclusion. Mr. Barker is simply one of the theological gnats that are always ready to sting any intruder on their special domain of dogmatic theology.

J. W. JACKSON.

INSPIRATION.

"A RECTOR" at pp. 463—5 of your January number writes in a reverential spirit. It is on that very account with the more pain that I see him profess his belief that our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles were "entirely unacquainted with Hebrew." It was not so with the Lord after his ascension, for he spoke to St. Paul "*in the Hebrew tongue*," (Acts xxvi. 14.) Most of your readers will, I think, believe that it could not have been so with him at the opening of his ministry, when he read the passage of the Scriptures for the day from Isaiah in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke iv. 17—21). Is it likely that it was so even at the age of twelve, when he disputed with *the doctors* in the temple; or was it the case with the apostles, on whom the gift of tongues was bestowed after the Lord's ascension? Let the matter be put in the form of a syllogism, thus:—

If any one sent from God, or commissioned by God, to communicate a knowledge of his will to men, used the LXX. translation in quoting the Old Testament, or made any variation from the exact sense of the Hebrew, it is a proof that he did not understand Hebrew.

The Lord Jesus Christ, and several of his apostles, the one being sent by the Father and the other by him, as he was sent by the Father, to communicate, etc., did so use, etc., and quote, etc.

Therefore it is a proof that they did not understand Hebrew.

The fallacy lies in the major premiss. There may have been, and there were, reasons for their practice in the fact, that the Greek language was to be in the main that of the New Testament, shewing that this was best suited on the whole to the times and to the future of the Church; and if the Lord and his apostles often departed from the exact sense of the Hebrew in passages they quoted from the Old Testament, their variations have, by the very fact of their having made them, as much the sanction of the Holy Ghost as the original Hebrew. Indeed, the Lord himself said: "The word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me" (John xiv. 25). "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak." And as for the apostles, they spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, as much as the Prophets who were before them. So, then, whether they quote the Old Testa-

ment exactly according to the Hebrew, or whether they quote it exactly, or whether they do not quote it at all, their words are equally to be received.

It is with similar regret that I find your correspondent writing, in the same letter: "If the writers of the New Testament regarded the writings of the Old as verbally inspired, in the sense in which inspiration is claimed for them by writers of what is commonly termed the evangelical school of theology, it would seem to follow as a natural and direct consequence, that they would have been most careful upon all occasions to quote the *ipsissima verba* of the original, if not in the original language itself, at least to adopt such a version thereof as should secure to their readers a faithful and perfect representation and reflection of that divine original."

Let him apply the same reasoning to the departure which Moses made, in relating the Fourth Commandment, as he is recorded to have done in Deut. v., from the words of the same commandment as written by the finger of God on the tables, and as given in Ex. xx., and he will find that he is very much using, without being aware of it, the unhappy argument of Bishop Colenso on this subject.

EDWARD BILEY.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

THE Book of Judges in its chronological statements does not present in my opinion any serious difficulty to our accepting the period of four hundred and eighty years, as stated in 1 Kings vi. 1, to have elapsed between the exodus and the building of Solomon's temple. It seems quite apparent, from some passages in that book, that all the events related in it did not take place in consecutive years, but that some of them were happening at the same period in different portions of the territories of the twelve tribes. It is the statement of St. Paul in Acts xiii. 20, where he says that the period of the Judges lasted for almost four hundred and fifty years, that seems at first sight to be irreconcilable with the chronology of 1 Kings. My own belief is that the apostle does not speak of consecutive years, but only means to say that the several periods mentioned in Judges would, when added together, amount to the time he mentions, though the actual period in consecutive years was not so great. Suppose that a pestilence raged in Scotland for ten years, commencing from 1697 and ending in 1706, and that a famine afflicted the southern portions of Britain for a period of five years, commencing in the year 1694, those two events would in consecutive years embrace a period of thirteen years, but if added together might be said to embrace one of fifteen. It is in this latter way I suppose St. Paul to speak in Acts xiii. It seems to me, however, a very unusual mode of reckoning time, and I should therefore feel much obliged if any of your correspondents could furnish me with examples of the kind drawn from profane writers.

H. C.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work. By E. DE PRESSENSE.
London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

ALL the world knows or may guess that we owe the production of this volume as it is, and at this time, to the stimulus supplied by M. Renan's *Vie de Jesus*. The instincts of men are the same in theology and biblical criticism as they are in other domains. If an inundation threatens, all hands go to work, and every accessible material is pressed into a service of temporary, though of vital importance, and the danger may be averted: but for the future solid and massive ramparts are required, and they are an after thought and an after work. The volume of M. Renan bore proudly down upon the cherished beliefs of millions, and many men rushed forward to render its advance innocuous. The slight and often feeble but courageous efforts which repelled the immediate shock substantially averted the present danger, but it was felt that recourse must be had to something more solid and effectual. Hence works of greater magnitude, and in particular, the one before us.

Owing to the shortness of the time at our immediate disposal, we have not been able to go thoroughly into the merits of a volume which is worthy of the highest commendation. It first appeared, and very recently in French, but this translation was made from the proof sheets, as they passed through the press. The translator is a lady, Miss Annie Harwood, and she appears to have executed her task in a most praiseworthy manner. We may suggest in passing that revision is called for in respect to the forms of some foreign names and Greek words, and a few other details which do not in the least affect the substance of the work. As for the author, Dr. de Pressensé, he is confessedly one of the ablest living Protestant writers of France on the side of moderate orthodoxy. To rare natural powers, highly disciplined, he unites a firm faith in the verities of our holy religion, untiring industry and zeal, great literary skill, and an extraordinary amount of learning. All these endowments have been put into requisition in the production of a truly admirable book, the plan of which is singularly philosophical and comprehensive, and the execution most thorough and effective. Of all the publications which have been called forth by M. Renan's remarkable volume, this is the most complete and satisfactory we have seen. We shall be surprised if it does not command a large circulation, and we are quite sure that even those who sympathize with M. Renan's particular opinions will be compelled to respect a cause which has so redoubtable an advocate. It is something marvellous that a man should be able to accumulate so diversified a mass of facts, illustrations, and arguments, in so short a time as this work must have been composed in. We shall endeavour to examine it more at length and to state some of its leading features in a subsequent notice, but in the meantime we have much pleasure in welcoming it, and cordially recommending it to the consideration of our readers and the intelligent Christian public.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus, with a new Translation. By JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D., I.C.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

SOME time ago Dr. Murphy issued a volume on the Book of Genesis. That book contained much admirable matter, along with sundry things with which we could not concur. The one now before us we like better; and we have found in it so much that we like, that we can speak well of it as a very serviceable and meritorious production. The author has not only given us a new translation, and introduced many valuable critical notes, but he has collected a multitude of observations and illustrations of an exceedingly useful and appropriate character. The analysis and explanation of the historical as well as legal portions will generally be found both clear and satisfactory; and although the work emanates from a scholar who uses freely his knowledge of Hebrew, it is manifest that all readers of ordinary intelligence may use it without difficulty. Good expositions of Exodus are by no means plentiful in our language, but the enterprising publishers of this volume are contributing handsomely towards the supply of the deficiency. The very useful work of Keil and Delitzsch, which preceded this, we have heretofore commended, and now we are happy to speak well of another volume from the same house. The orderly and straight onward course of Dr. Murphy contrasts favourably with the fitting and fragmentary mode of Dr. Colenso. We are pleased with the work, and we cheerfully recommend it.

Every-day Scripture Difficulties. Part II. A Series of Readings on the Gospels according to St. Luke and St. John. By J. E. PRESCOTT, M.A. London: Longmans.

In 1863 Mr. Prescott gave us a capital volume, with the same general title as the present, elucidative of a number of texts in the first and second Gospels; he has now carried on his plan with the two last Gospels. The book is one of a class which we hold in high estimation, and we believe it to be very trustworthy and meritorious. An examination of the text shews that the author is of the right school, that he carefully investigates and clearly realizes the points at issue, and that he generally sees his way to a consistent solution. That he is laborious and conscientious is even more plainly indicated by the numerous and learned foot notes, in which references will be found to a host of authorities. The spirit of the book is like its aim, very commendable. We do not, of course, pledge ourselves to every conclusion which the learned author has arrived at, but we are sure that his researches will be found useful and acceptable to many whose functions call them to expound the Gospels, while active duties and other causes forbid them to go thoroughly into many interesting topics, upon which they have to pronounce an opinion. Having expressed ourselves so favourably of this volume, we need do no more than express the hope that its author will be induced to continue his useful labours.

The Legends and Theories of the Buddhists, compared with History and Science: with introductory notices of the life and system of Gotama Buddha. By R. SPENCE HARDY. London: Williams and Norgate.

BUDDHISM is a great problem, and every book upon the subject by a competent authority ought to be gladly welcomed. That Mr. Hardy is an authority is undeniable; his *Eastern Monachism* and his *Manual of Buddhism* are two most useful and curious books, abounding in rare and instructive matter. The work before us may contain some things which are to be found in the two volumes we have mentioned, but it includes much additional matter, and many views and observations which will help an ordinary reader to understand better what Buddhism really is. The information supplied upon the legends and principles of the most remarkable of existing sects is such as could have been contributed only by one who has access to original sources. Now we all know that the original sources are inaccessible to all except a very few among the inhabitants of Europe, and this fact should make us prize the more volumes such as the one in our hands. It is manifest that a much larger work could have been written, but for most readers we suppose the volume will be all the more acceptable for being kept within its actual limits. There are some among us who promulgate false and mischievous views about Buddhism, and whether for their correction or for placing the real facts of the case before the public mind this neat and compendious book will be invaluable.

Household Theology; a handbook of Religious information respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer Book, the Church, the Ministry, Divine Worship, the Creeds, etc., etc. By the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT. Second Edition. London: Rivingtons.

WE are very glad to see a second cheaper and revised issue of a well-designed manual, the nature and aims of which are sufficiently indicated by its title. The book is to some extent apologetic, but it is principally valuable for the multitudinous items of information which it contains on theological and ecclesiastical matters. In the former edition we observed some slight errors, and even in this there are a few statements which require emendation; two or three of these we will mention by way of example. At page 96 there is a table of "ministerial titles used in the New Testament" manifestly intended to shew what names Christian ministers there receive. Our greatest critics tells us that a minister of the Gospel is nowhere called a priest (*Hiereus*) in the New Testament: but Mr. Blunt includes this in his list, with a reference to Heb. iii. 1. On turning to the passage, we find that it designates the Lord Jesus, and calls him an *Archiereus* or High-priest, a point which should be cleared up. At page 195 George Fox the Quaker is called "a cobbler:" is this correct? On the same page the Mormonites are said to have been introduced into this country in 1850; this is wrong; they were here certainly about 1835. At page 237 Joseph Smith the

Mormon is said to have taught polygamy; we believe it was not taught in his lifetime. With such exceptions the book may be strongly recommended. Let us hope the learned author will look narrowly into all these minutiae. He will not take it amiss if we ask him whether anything worth the name of an authority can be found for ascribing the foundation of the Gaulish and British Churches to St. Paul and *St. Joseph of Arimathea*?" The case is doubtful enough in all conscience in regard to St. Paul, but with respect to Joseph of Arimathea we have always looked upon the legends about him as unquestionably fables.

The Vicarious Sacrifice grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation.

By HORACE BUSHNELL, D.D. London: A. STRAHAN.

ACCORDING to the Scriptures Christ suffered. He either suffered for himself or for others; but he did not suffer for himself, and we are, therefore, shut up to the principle of a vicarious suffering. Now a vicarious suffering is a sacrifice, and every true sacrifice involves the idea of vicariousness or substitution. Dr. Bushnell, in this profound and thoughtful book, ranges his whole subject under four separate heads:—1. "Nothing superlative in vicarious sacrifice, or above the universal principles of right and duty;" 2. "The life and sacrifice of Christ is what he does to become a renovating and saving power;" 3. "The relations of God's law and justice to his saving work in Christ;" 4. "Sacrificial symbols and their uses." Whatever the reason, there is in many minds an unconquerable antipathy to the term "Vicarious," just as in other minds there is a strong dislike of the word "Sacrifice," when applied to Christ. As for the latter, it cannot fairly be excepted to by those who admit the paramount authority of the Holy Scriptures. The other, "Vicarious," is confessedly a compendious and convenient word for summing up and setting forth a truth which the Bible teaches in other terms; and it is to be opposed or defended on the same principles as "Trinity," and other theological words. According to Dr. Bushnell, the true conception of the Vicarious Sacrifice is—"that Christ, in what is called his vicarious sacrifice, simply engages, at the expense of great suffering, and even of death itself, to bring us out of our sins themselves, and so out of their penalties; being Himself profoundly identified with us in our fallen state, and burdened in feeling with our evils." The volume will require, and we are convinced will repay, a close and attentive perusal; and now that English divines do not often produce exhaustive works on theological, or rather, doctrinal questions, needed though they be, we strongly urge the claims of this very profound and valuable publication.

The Sacrifice of the Death of Christ. A Sermon. By LORD ARTHUR HERVEY, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co.

THIS sermon was preached in Ely Cathedral at the ordination held by the Bishop on Advent Sunday last. The text is Acts iv. 12, and the discourse itself is a clear, faithful, and earnest exhibition and applica-

tion of the subject, in its relation to the persons addressed. If the gentlemen who heard the sermon strive by God's grace to minister in harmony with its teachings, it will be well for them and the flocks they oversee.

The Prayer Book Interleaved, with Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes arranged parallel to the Text. By Rev. W. M. CAMPION, B.D., and Rev. W. J. BEAMONT, M.A. With Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF ELY. London: Rivingtons.

THE plan of this book is ingenious, the text occupying every page on the right hand, and the notes and illustrations the pages opposite. The editors have performed their part in a thoroughly scholar-like manner, and their elaborate commentary, as we may style it, appears to be every way trustworthy. Not only is the work singularly accurate, so far as we can test it, but the materials supplied by the editors have been selected with good taste and judgment. The exceeding variety of these materials, drawn, too, from most numerous, and often recondite sources, shews that a large amount of patient research has been employed in their preparation. Many of the notes are curious and interesting, as well as practically valuable, and we do not remember any other work which throws so much real and direct light upon the Book of Common Prayer. Acts of uniformity and numerous other documents of importance are either reproduced at length or extensively quoted. The sources of most of the contents of the Prayer Book are indicated. Literary and historical items are scattered in profusion over the pages, and the articles are wisely introduced. The volume will be of inestimable value to all who wish to know the history and structure of the national formulary; and we may safely say we have seldom seen a book more creditable to editors and publishers alike.

Discourses delivered on Special Occasions. By R. W. DALE, M.A. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

MR. DALE is the well-known minister of Carr's Lane Chapel, Birmingham; and he is held in high esteem as an eloquent preacher, an able thinker, and a man of learning. These discourses are ten in number; four were delivered before the author's congregation, and the remainder in different parts of the country. The subjects are diversified and attractive; some of them very important, and all of them treated in an excellent manner. There are few Nonconformist ministers in this country who are better qualified to deal with great questions, and we doubt not this volume will be read with much interest and profit by many of different religious denominations. In these critical times it is refreshing to meet with sermons which are characterized by the breadth, vigour, transparency and earnestness which distinguish these. It would be difficult to find in them anything which can be designated narrow and one-sided; but easy to find in them the proof that the preacher is a man of strong convictions, who speaks out boldly and fearlessly whatever he believes to be God's truth. Therefore, while on the one hand

they are marked by decided originality and individuality, they present broad and comprehensive views on all principal matters. Their language is elevated, pure, and transparent, singularly free from conventionalisms, and founded on the best models. Without specifying particular sermons we can say that they are all powerful, and some of them admirable.

Sermons and Expositions. By the late JOHN ROBERTSON, D.D.
With a Memoir by Rev. J. G. YOUNG. London: A. Strahan.

DR. Robertson was born in Perth in 1824, and died in January, 1865. In 1857 he became the minister of Glasgow cathedral, in which office he remained till his lamented decease. He was a man of great personal excellence, and zeal, and his ministerial endowments were such as to make him both popular and useful. Our readers will be much interested in the memoir of him which precedes his sermons. The sermons are of a very superior character, and some of them worthy of any pulpit. They are followed by a series of "Thoughts and Expositions," among which are some of particular interest and value, not merely for the sentiments they embody, but for the proof they give of the author's desire to excel in all learning. The characters of eminent piety and unquestionable orthodoxy are unmistakeably impressed upon this work, which we receive with gratitude and lay down with regret, for who among us can but regret the too early removal of one who had not only given so much promise, but the earnest of its realization?

Christian Light of the World. By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D. London: Strahan and Co.

Free and Open Worship. A Sermon by C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D. London: Macmillan and Co.

DR. Vaughan needs no introduction. His volume, entitled "Christ the Light of the World," comprises a series of twelve sermons, homilies, or discourses, meditations, or chapters, we know not which they are to be called. The subjects relate to Christ and the gospel, and are as follows:—Why he came; the Lamp and the Light; Nunc dimittis; Uses of Light; a Man of Sorrows; the Gospel of the Fall; the Gospel of the Flood; Christ the Lord of Nature; the Conqueror of Satan, the Destroyer of Death; the Sinner's Friend; Cast out and Found. The treatment is simple, graceful, practical and devout; the volume, therefore, is to be confidently recommended to those who desire "the words of the wise in quiet," for personal edification. The separate sermon on free and open worship deserves to be recorded, and we must say, to be read, although it scarcely comes within the range of our criticism.

Thoughts on Personal Religion, being a Treatise on the Christian Life in its two chief elements, Devotion and Practice. By E. M. GOULBURN, D.D. New edition. London: Rivingtons.

It must be very gratifying to Dr. Goulburn, as it is to multitudes

besides, to find this admirable book so widely appreciated. The rapid issue of, we believe, eight editions in four years or thereabouts supercedes the necessity for criticism.

Theology and Life, Sermons chiefly on Special Occasions. By E. H. PLUMPTRE, M. A. London: A. Strahan.

PROFESSOR Plumptre is very well known as a Biblical and classical scholar and critic; and the discourses now before us bear unmistakeable evidence to his zeal for learned research. Of the twenty-one sermons contained in this volume very few, if any, fail to shew that the preacher is learned as well as wise, and that however he may differ from this or that school, his thoughts and theories are his own, and with reasons to back them. Whatever ridicule or pity may be bestowed upon the modern pulpit by some classes of society, it is madness to say that the pulpit has no life, intelligence, or power, while it produces discourses like those before us. Without accepting every critical opinion advanced by the author, we are happy to call attention to this volume as one of a very superior order, and by no means to be classed with the ordinary run of sermons. It may suffice to shew that Professor Plumptre is not moved by noisy and pretentious but shallow men, to observe that he calls Bishop Butler, the "greatest thinker of the English Church." To our mind, he is about correct; but is he *à la mode*? Strange that we should have to employ this last phrase; but who can deny that there is a fashion in philosophy and science, in doctrine and in ritual, just as there used to be fashionable saints, and earlier still, fashionable gods? Happily there is one Sun in heaven, however often men may change their colours.

St. John Chrysostom on the Priesthood. In Six Books. Translated from the original Greek by B. HARRIS COWPER. London: Williams and Norgate.

THAT many portions of Chrysostom's Greek are stubbornly opposed to receiving an English dress is known to his readers; and it happens rather unfortunately that the work on the Priesthood is by no means easy in all places to translate. Nevertheless it has been rendered more or less frequently into Latin, German, and French, while four or five versions in English preceded the present. The high reputation of the work and the utility of it being admitted, it is singular that copies in English should be so rare as to be procured with difficulty. The frequent demand for the book and other considerations seemed to justify a new translation, which has been executed by the editor of this Journal, with what success other critics must declare. The principles which have guided him are expounded in his introduction, and all turn upon that of presenting an intelligible rendering of Chrysostom's work as it is, without regarding his conformities or non-conformities with the phraseology and views, practices and requirements of existing churches. Although, for obvious reasons, the book cannot be reviewed in these

pages, it is allowable to state that it is elegantly got up, and that every endeavour has been made to facilitate its use by a careful display of its chapters, and a consecutive numbering of all its lesser sections. The introduction includes a view of some of the leading features of this remarkable treatise.

Sacred Allegories. By the Rev. W. ADAMS, M.A. New Edition, illustrated. London: Rivingtons.

THIS very neat edition of an esteemed and excellent work will be welcomed by many. It is elegant in appearance, and written in a style of much purity and beauty. The principles embodied are in all respects those of the Church of England. To youthful readers especially it will be a source of never-failing delight and wholesome instruction. Some of the allegories are wonderfully constructed, and it has been said with reason that the "Old Man's Home" is one of the best which has been produced since the days of John Bunyan.

Science and Christian Thought. By JOHN DUNS, D.D., F.R.S.E. London: Religious Tract Society.

WE have been much pleased with this thoughtful and able consideration of some of the great problems of the day. It exhibits in a popular form many of those facts and arguments to which attention is called in our controversial age. The author shews himself to be master of his subject, and has produced one of the most useful manuals we have seen for general reading. City missionaries and all who are brought into contact with the immense and protean mass of unbelief which floats among the working classes will do well to obtain this convenient volume. It is both scholarlike and scientific, and based on sound principles. We thoroughly approve of the author's leading positions and conclusions.

The Angels' Song. By THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D. London: Strahan.

A CHARMING little book on some of the most interesting and important topics connected with human redemption. It is characterized by the peculiar excellencies which distinguish its pious and talented author. The style is glowing and brilliant, and the tone throughout is that of fervent and unwavering faith. We anticipate for it an extensive circulation.

Lyra Fidelium. Twelve Hymns on the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed. By S. J. STONE, B.A. London: Parker.

THIS is a very nice book elegantly got up. The plan is ingenious: the poetry occupies the left hand pages, while those on the right are adorned with prose paraphrases of the successive article, and a happy selection of appropriate texts. The versification is smooth and simple, the sentiments are scriptural and devout, and the measures adopted conform to those of some of our sweetest tunes. Mr. Stone has on

more than one occasion shewn that he has the gift of sacred song, and and his reputation will be increased by these sweet notes of his Christian lyre, which we have sincere pleasure in recommending.

The Augustine Hymn Book. A Hymnal for all Churches. Compiled by D. THOMAS, D.D. London: F. Pitman.

THIS book is based upon a principle: the hymns are direct addresses to the Divine Being. Every one knows how miscellaneous in form are the contents of ordinary hymn books, and how many among them are exhortations, reproofs, doctrinal discussions, and whatever can be pressed into the service of sacred poetry. Unhappily the substance of many pieces known as hymns is of doubtful propriety, and what shall we say of their literary merit or demerit? Under all the circumstances it affords us much pleasure to meet with this practical endeavour to produce a reformed hymn book. Its contents are very diversified, and include many long established favourites. Some will regret, however, that the editor's plan compelled him either to exclude or to alter a number of well-known compositions. He has excluded some and altered others, and for the sake of everybody has relegated others to the end of the book where they appear as "Sacred Poetry." A selection of anthems, canticles, and psalms, is included, and copious indexes are supplied. *The Augustine Hymn Book* is one which has many recommendations, and although Dr. Thomas can hardly expect to convert everybody to his views, he deserves to be, and probably will be successful in securing an extensive adoption of his book.

Organized Christianity. Is it of man or of God? By the Author of the *Destiny of the Human Race*. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

THE pious, but somewhat speculative, author of this little work presents us with a series of considerations ranged under ten or twelve heads, and bearing upon organized Christianity. We cannot at all agree with him on a number of points, and it is quite impossible for us to discuss some of his positions, this for instance—that the great peculiarity of the primitive Church was the entire absence in it of any organization *for aggressive purposes*. The italics here are the author's. But while we cannot wholly approve or at all criticise the book, we do not hesitate to bear witness to its unselfish and disinterested motives, its purity of aim, and the justness of many of its accusations, not to mention the verisimilitude of some of its suggestions.

A Narrative of Missionary Enterprizes in the South Sea Islands, with remarks upon the natural history of the islands, origin, languages, traditions, and usages of the inhabitants. By Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS. 56th thousand, illustrated. London: Snow.

JOHN WILLIAMS was as true a saint and martyr as any man that has been canonized, and the record of his wonderful life and labours and of

his tragical end will be read with undiminished interest by generations yet unborn. This admirable narrative is remarkably cheap, and for the sake of a shilling should not be kept out of any library. Williams was a minister of God's making, called like the herdsman of Tekoa, and sent to the antipodes to do a great work, for which multitudes bless him in this world and will bless him in the next.

Crisis Hupfeldiana ; being an Examination of Hupfeld's Criticism on Genesis, as recently set forth in Bishop Colenso's Fifth Part. By W. KAY, D.D. Oxford and London: Parkers.

THERE are doubtless many who, like ourselves, begin to hope the Colenso controversy will soon be only matter of history. For reasons which we need not name, the recent marshalling of all available objections against the historic truth of important portions of the Old Testament, caused an unusual commotion in the world. But it is now becoming quite clear that, in one form or another, the Pentateuch had often encountered similar attacks, and stood its ground, *nec tamen consumebatur*. Still, the mere circumstance that no former onslaught was attended by such clamour, has occasioned an unprecedented shew of resistance. Some of the literary productions of the time will soon pass into oblivion, but others are endowed with vitality, and in general the result will be a more tremendous arsenal of defensive weapons than we should otherwise have possessed. Dr. Kay has done wisely in limiting his labours to Hupfeld's criticism as employed by Dr. Colenso, and as an exposure of the fallacious shallowness of many a vaunted critical argument, his essay will merit attention. We hope that at least one result of this searching pamphlet will be to prove that Hebrew criticism is not wholly the possession of rationalists, but that men who believe the Bible true and inspired, are as familiar with the dead letter as those who doubt or deny it. We are afraid that Dr. Colenso has been badly advised, but we trust he will be won by wiser counsels, and that not only he but his followers will listen to Dr. Kay.

Swedenborg and his modern Critics ; with some Remarks upon the Last Times. By Rev. A. CLISSOLD, M.A. London: Longmans.

THE principles of Swedenborg are an interesting study as a psychological development; but we do not think that so far as they are peculiar to him they are of any but human invention and authority. Every student is aware that mystical and allegorical and spiritualizing interpretations of Scripture are to be found in all ages, but it is not always that they lead to deviations from catholic doctrine: they may do it however, and we believe have done it in the Roman Church, and that of Swedenborg. Mr. Clissold is a man of talent, but he is also characterized by ingenuity and energy; and upon the active cultivation of these two last, we believe the existence of Swedenborgianism depends. It may be our misfortune, but after frequent observations during a number of years, we have never been able to discover any

reason to justify the special doctrines of Mr. Clissold's party. Our objections to some of their doctrines are of the gravest description. At the same time, we shall not take any part in the incessant controversy which such anomalous forms of Christianity must provoke, until men cease to build upon their own assumptions a structure of avowed infallibility.

Reformation the True Road to Unity. A Plea for a Revision of the Prayer Book, and of the Authorized Version of the Bible. By the Rev. ARTHUR WOLFE, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.

ON looking at the prefaces to the Bible of 1611, and Prayer Book of 1662, we find no intimation that they were to be accepted as final; on the contrary both declare their imperfection and liability to improvement. There is nothing against revision in the history of the English Bible and Prayer Book; both of them having been *de facto* revised repeatedly; and no period having elapsed without urgent pleas for their further improvement. Why then so much hostility to the actual movements in the same direction? Others must answer this enquiry, but finding neither principle nor practice which discourages revision, we so far agree with Mr. Wolfe; finding also many and grave reasons for a revision, we again agree with him. With the special question touching the Prayer Book we cannot here intermeddle, but we can express an opinion on the general subject, and with respect to the English Bible, we are at liberty to say that after many years of patient study of it, along with the original texts, we find the pleas for revision irresistible, as well on moral as on critical grounds. We must not apply to our Bible the principle of Horace—

"Ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis
Offendar maculis, etc."

The Cambridge Year Book and University Almanack for 1866. Edited by W. WHITE. London: Rivingtons.

THIS excellent publication is one which supplies abundant information upon all matters connected with the University of Cambridge, giving not only an almanack and diversified statistics, but examination papers, necrology and a host of other useful items. It is a most carefully compiled manual, and a complete guide to the University.

Parker's Church Calendar and General Almanack for the Year of our Lord 1866. London: Parker.

WE received this too late for notice in our last, but we desire to record our appreciation of its merits, and our experience of its usefulness.

The Mystical Beast of the Revelation, with his name and Number; according to the Scriptures. By BIBLARIDIUS. London: Bagsters.

ANOTHER solution of the Apocalyptic 666. Our author believes the

Pope is meant, and that this is proved because the required number is found in the Greek letters *ο αγιος πατηρ γης* and also in *ο θεος πατηρ γης*. We regret to be unable to acquiesce in an argument derived from such questionable premisses; and we fear the *Œdipus* who is to solve this mystery has not yet appeared.

The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms; their Divine Inspiration asserted upon the authority of our Lord and Vindicated from objections. With animadversions in Disproof of the Testimony of Josephus in reference to the Canon. By JOHN COLLYER KNIGHT. London: Longmans.

THIS is a very interesting essay, in which Mr. Knight pleads for a real but limited inspiration. Although we are constrained to differ from the author on a number of points, we feel sure that the facts he has brought together, and the considerations he has advanced, will have a preponderating influence on the side of views which we believe to be true. We commend the essay to the attention of those who are at all occupied with the two great questions of inspiration and the Canon.

The Epistle to the Galatians with an Introduction, Explanatory Notes, Practical Thoughts and Prayers for Private and Family Use. By E. HEADLAND, M.A., and H. B. SWETE, M.A. London: Hatchard and Co.

THE same editors published some time since a similar work on the epistles to the Thessalonians, of which this may be looked upon as a continuation. The introduction, therefore, pursues the thread of the apostolic history from the point where it was dropped in the former volume. The authorized English version is printed at length with summaries, references to parallel texts, suggested emendations and notes. Each section is followed by practical thoughts, a prayer and a hymn, so that the work is adapted for devotional use in the family or the closet. The principles of the authors are those of orthodox moderate churchmanship, regarding religion as something spiritual which does not depend upon nor profit by external pomp and show—"the glitter of a showy ritual." The volume has been compiled in a manner highly complimentary to the endowments and piety of Messrs. Headland and Swete, and we are glad to call it a sound and useful work.

Is the Bible the Word of God? Thoughts in answer to the Question. By a layman of the Church of England. Bristol: Chillcott.

THE author holds that in the original text every sentence, word, syllable, and letter was God's; and that the Bible is infallible, indisputable, and eternal. We are afraid he pushes his principles farther than was believed necessary for some centuries after Christ, and farther than has ever been deemed requisite by the great majority of Christians.

The Seven Beatitudes, Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments, arranged and illustrated according to the Principles of Scripture Parallelism.
By Rev. JOHN FORBES, LL.D. - Edinburgh: Taylor.

SEVERAL writers have from time to time exercised their ingenuity in exhibiting in the form of parallels, sundry portions of Holy Scripture in addition to the poetical books. One endeavour of the kind appears in the pamphlet mentioned above, and we beg to commend it to the favourable notice of our readers; at present we are unable to do more than call attention to it as well worthy of study, and that we expect to find room for some special consideration of Dr. Forbes's principles.

EIPHNIKA. *The wholesome words of Holy Scripture, concerning questions now disputed in the Church.* Part 2, Regeneration, Renewal and renewing growth, Conversion. With appendices illustrative of the primitive usage of these terms, and of questions of Greek Criticism. By Rev. W. B. MARRIATT, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

MR. MARRIATT's first part was on "Inspiration," and his third is to treat of the "Supper of the Lord." We pronounce no opinion on the theological views of the author, but we may express our approval of the conscientious and praiseworthy manner in which he has performed his literary labour. A large supplement contains numerous extracts, and what the French call "*pièces justificatives*." An alphabetical index comprehends the matters treated of in Part 1,—that and this together being regarded as forming a volume.

A Commentary or Exposition upon the Prophecy of Obadiah. By EDWARD MARBURY. Also on Habakkuk by the same author. Edinburgh: J. Nichol.

The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D. Vol. xi. Edinburgh: J. Nichol.
The Complete Works of Stephen Charnock, B.D. Vol. V. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

THE second and third of these handsome volumes belong to Nichol's series of standard divines of the Puritan period. The authors are well known and highly esteemed by readers of our old divinity, and are wonderful specimens of the profound and laborious men who nourished the faith and piety of our forefathers.

The other volume belongs to the series of commentaries also issued by Mr. Nichol. It is edited very carefully by Mr. Grosart, whose enthusiasm in this department of literature is well known and most praiseworthy. The editor has prefixed to the volume a short memoir of Marbury, who was a puritan in doctrine and a royalist in politics, a London clergyman and perhaps sequestered in 1642. The volume is beautifully printed and forms a worthy member of the valuable series to which it is attached.

We beg to repeat our reiterated recommendation of the important reprints which Mr. Nichol is producing in so excellent a style and at so low a price.

The Spiritual Temple of the Spiritual God; being the substance of Sermons preached in the English Church, Dresden. By Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, M.A. London: Nisbet and Co.

THE sermons in this volume are eight in number, and we give their titles at length: The Cleansing of the Temple; The Transfiguration and its lessons; The Humiliation and Exaltation of the Lord Jesus; The enemies of the Lord and the Lord's Decree; The Spirit's work in Regeneration; The Time for seeking Salvation; The Consecration of the Temple; The Polishing of the Temple Stones, or the Causes of Affliction as set forth in the Book of Job. Mr. Wright is a valued and learned contributor of ours, but we are happy to meet him in the more directly practical character of a preacher. His theology is substantially evangelical, but his critical habits enable him to handle his subjects in a clear and original manner. His sermons have a freshness and unction about them which assure us of his profound personal convictions, and which qualify him to speak powerfully to the heart and conscience. As might be expected he is liberal and comprehensive in many of his views, and he consequently will be specially appreciated by enlightened and intelligent Christians. The discourses as a whole are of a superior order, and there are in them many very forcible and even admirable passages. Where there is so much that is excellent it is needless to point out individual discourses; we may observe, however, that in the very able sermon on Job the author has introduced a number of learned notes which sufficiently attest his skill in sacred criticism.

The Awakening of Italy and the Crisis of Rome. By Rev. J. A. WYLIE, LL.D. London: Religious Tract Society.

THIS book is partly historical, partly descriptive, and partly anticipatory. It is written in an agreeable style, and a decidedly evangelical spirit, by an author who is intimately acquainted with Italy and Italian matters. A wonderful amount of valuable and important information is crowded into its pages, and we imagine there are few who will read it without profit. The revelations it makes are startling enough, and shew that from a religious point of view Italy has peculiar claims upon our regard and sympathy. We sincerely trust the volume will be widely circulated and do much good.

The Necessary Existence of God. By W. H. GILLESPIE, Esq. Fourth Edition. London: Houlston and Wright.

The Argument, à priori, for the Moral Attributes of God. By W. H. GILLESPIE. Edinburgh: Nimmo.

WE had hoped to give something like an adequate representation of the course pursued in these two works, but have been prevented by the excessive demand made on our space by Articles. Probably the Atheist was never more firmly grappled with on *à priori* grounds than in these two works. Human reason can scarcely hope to come nearer to a de-

monstration than Mr. Gillespie has come. His first book has been much elaborated since it originally appeared; but the one on the Moral Attributes is a recent publication. We should like to see a formal refutation of these works from the pen of a secularist. This, however, is not to be hoped for, as the party is more mighty in denunciation, ridicule and obscene blasphemy than in logic and philosophy, or the honest pursuit of truth.

Hieroclis Synecdemus, et Notitiæ Græcæ Episcopatum: accedunt Nili Doxapatrii notitia Patriarchatum et Locorum nomina immutata.
G. PARTHEY. Beralini.

IT will be sufficient to enter here for the benefit of learned students of ancient Church history, the title of this erudite compilation. To the Greek texts Latin versions are appended, and there is a complete index to all the names of places, with other useful materials.

The Biblical Criticism of the Glasgow Presbytery criticized. By a Chapel Minister; with preface by NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D. Glasgow: Maclehose.

THIS is a brief and somewhat clever pamphlet on the side of Dr. Macleod in a controversy which may cause great changes in Scotland on the Sabbath question.

Visible Unity. A Letter to the Venerable Archdeacon Wordsworth, D.D.
By SENEX. London: Hatchard and Co.

WE think Dr. Pusey has in his Eirenicon pronounced an eternal sentence against Rome as it is while pleading for union with it. Henceforth no man need go ignorantly to Rome. Dr. Pusey is the great puzzle of our Age: we cannot possibly understand how he has or ever had an atom of hope that he should promote equal communion with Rome by his recent remarkable book. What would our Jewels and Halls and Chillingworths and Stillingfleets, say to such a phenomenon! Without going into details, we may, however, remind our readers, that in 1704 a book appeared called "An Essay towards a proposal for Catholic Communion, etc. By a Minister of the Church of England." This work is of doubtful authorship, but its whole drift is to shew that the English and Romish Churches do not differ essentially. Like all such essays it is artful and prejudiced; and of course left the two Churches as far asunder as ever. This will be the case now. Senex need not fear the continuance of the tide towards Rome: it must ebb.

The Pestilence: why Inflicted; its duration and desolating character.
By JAMES BIDEN. Gosport: Legg.

MR. BIDEN has invented an exposition of many texts of Scripture, quite different in some of its details from aught we were before acquainted with. He should really be dissuaded, if it can be, from publishing any more such nonsense. The man is under an hallucina-

tion, *e.g.* "He is called by name Biden (a sheep two years old, fit for sacrifice), a Latin inscription over the King of the Jews; in Saxon, endurance, tenacity." And a few lines further on: "From the bowels of his mother mention is made of his name—Messum, her maiden name being the Hebrew plural form, the Messiah, anointed (Isaiah xlix. 1)," (p. 7). We hope the author of *La Littérature des Fous* will hear of this pamphlet before he publishes another edition. On the other hand, Mrs. Elizabeth Cottle might study Mr. Biden's pages with advantage.

Doth God take care for Oxen? A Sermon before the University.
By R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius
Professor of Divinity. Oxford and London: Parker and Co.

A SEASONABLE, appropriate, intelligent and practical Christian sermon on the cattle murrain.

The Law of Christian Charity. A Sermon. By E. LANGDON, B.A.
Oxford and London: Parker and Co.

A GOOD sermon, cast in the mould of a liberal and healthy spirit.

We have received and beg to call attention to the following:—

Five Years in Kent Street; or, Intelligence from a Missionary Station in London. By Rev. James Amos, M.A.

Correspondence des Réformateurs dans les Pays de Langues Française, edited with notes by A. L. Herminjard. Vol. I.

The January number of The Pulpit Analyst.

Colonial Church Chronicle.

The Koran and the Bible; or, Islam and Christianity. By J. M. Arnold, B.D. Second Edition. Longmans.

Corrections of Copies of New Testament portion of the Vat. MS. By H. Heinfetter. London: Evans.

Schola Syriaca complectens Chrestomathiam cum apparatu grammatico et Lexicon Chrestomathiæ Accommodatum. J. B. Wenig. Pars I. Chrestom. cum Appar. Gram. London: Williams and Norgate.

Histoire Critique des Livres de l'Ancien Testament, par A. Kuenen. Translated by M. A. Pierson; with a Preface by E. Renan. Tom. I. Historical Books. Paris.

Geschichte der Apostel. von Tode Jesu bis zur Zerstörung Jerusalems. By Dr. Sepp. Second Ed. with Introd. Schaffhausen.

Vorlesungen über die Christliche Dogmengeschichte. Von F. C. Baur. Das Dogma der Alten Kirche. Part II. Synod of Nicea to the end of Sixth Century. Edited by F. F. Baur. Leipsic.

Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Von H. E. F. Guericke. Ninth Edition. Vol. I. Leipsic.

Commentarius Perpetuus in Jacobi Epistolam. By H. Bouman. Utrecht.

Die Wunderthaten des Herrn in Bezug auf die neueste Kritik, betrachtet von F. L. Steinmeyer. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben.

MISCELLANIES.

Discoveries of M. de Rossi in the Catacombs.—We must not omit another remarkable discovery of M. de Rossi in these catacombs; the name of one who with many of his readers will rival in interest even martyr popes. The same kind of authorities which guided M. de Rossi in his adventurous, dare we use the coarse and profane word, “diggings” for buried Popes, led him to expect to find the name of S. Cæcilia in the same hallowed crypt. And so in due time S. Cæcilia reveals herself in distinct letters. We cannot fully trace out in our pages the course of this discovery; we are rather disposed to follow up with M. de Rossi a train of thought which might tend to throw some light on a most interesting question. Of its success we will not absolutely despair, as he does not despair. We would fain know the process by which some at least of the older and more famous names in Heathen, and Republican or Imperial Rome, passed over into the ranks of the Christians. On the whole it is clear to us, we think that it is beyond doubt, that the old noble families remained in general to the end the most obstinate Pagans. Men with the virtues as well as the birth and descent of old Rome (Milman's *History of Christianity*, iii., 80, 81); men like Vettius Prætextatus, were the hope and strength of the Pagan party. Paganism in that class did not expire till all the older and nobler families were scattered over the face of the world, after the ruin of Rome by Alaric and by Genseric. But there can be no doubt that many of them had already forsaken the Jove of the Capitol for the Cross of Christ. (Jerome's writings are conclusive for his period.) M. de Rossi observes that Cornelius is the only pope who bears what he calls the *diacritic* name of one of the famous Gentes.

Above the Catacomb of Callistus stands, or rather seems nodding to its fall, a huge mound, or ruined structure, manifestly one of the vast and costly monuments which in Heathen days lined the Appian Way. What if this was a monument of the Cæciliæ, built on an estate belonging to that noble family? What if S. Cæcilia was descended from this illustrious race?—what if the estate had passed into the hands of Christian Cæciliæ, and given a right and title, or at least furnished a free and lawful access to the subjacent catacomb? All this, we admit, is extremely visionary; but as an acknowledged vision may perhaps be indulged till disproved—it can hardly be fully confirmed—by later investigations. No one is more sensible than M. de Rossi of the difficulties which encumber, and which we fear must encumber, such questions:—

“Ma nelle tenebre che coprono le genealogie durante il secolo dell' impero, nel mescolamento delle stirpi e de' gentilizi, in mezzo a tanti nomini nuovi, innalzati dai principi ai supremi onori, è impossibile di veder chiaro, e dai soli nomi argomentare con sicurezza legami genealogici od ereditarii.”

Is there not the further and perhaps more serious difficulty, in the

assumption of, or permission to assume noble and gentilitian names, by Freedmen and Libertini?

Persecution after the reign of Decius was not unknown, especially under Valerian, in which occurred the martyrdom of Pope Sixtus II.; but it was intermittent, not more than local, till the final conflict under Diocletian. The late Cardinal Wiseman, it is well known, with his characteristic prudence, laid the scene of his romance of "*Fabiola*" in the reign of Diocletian, when above two centuries had matured and completed all the arrangements for Christian burial in the catacombs; when the Christians were perhaps driven to take refuge in these vast and unexplored depths, and really became what they have been fondly and foolishly declared, or suggested, or hinted to have been, *lucifugæ*. The Catacombs may in those dark days of calamity have become places of worship, even worship of martyrs, whose holy example the pious fugitives might at any time be called upon to follow. It is certainly a whimsical sign of the times that a grave Cardinal, in the fulness of his cardinalate, should have bowed to the all-ruling influence of novel-writing, and condescended to cast the doctrines of his Church into this attractive, it should seem almost indispensable, form. A Pope of old, and a very clever Pope, wrote a novel, but it was in his younger days of lay-hood; and if he heartily repented of the Boccaccio tone of his novel, he still hung with parental fondness over the elegance of its Latinity. Let us hasten to say that the Cardinal's romance (this is not mere respect for the departed) was not only altogether irreproachable, and in harmony with his stainless and serious character, but, if it had not been too didactic, its avowed but fatal aim, it might have enjoyed a wider and more lasting popularity. But the persecution of Diocletian is far less clearly illustrated than we might have expected from the study of the Catacombs. There is an obscurity which has not yet been dispersed, nor seems likely to be dispersed, over the acts and the fate of the Popes who at that period ruled in Rome. There are no years, from the very earliest in the Papal annals, so utterly obscure as those of Pope Marcellinus, A.D. 296-307. During the reign of Diocletian the great persecution commenced, Feb. 23, A.D. 303. It began and raged most fiercely in the East. Maximian ruled in the West, and in Rome. Diocletian appeared there to celebrate his Vicennalia, but soon departed. For Marcellinus himself, he was arraigned by the earlier Christian writers as an apostate who offered sacrifice to Cæsar. But this, as well as the fable of the Council of 300 Bishops of Sinuessa, is rejected by the later and better writers of the Church of Rome. But Marcellinus, as all agree, was no martyr. Where he was buried we know not. There is of course no vestige of him, nor, we believe, of his successor, Marcellus, in the Catacombs. The whole history in truth is a blank; even legend is modest.

With the cessation of the persecution the Church of Rome resumed, of course, with her other rights or immunities, the possession of her places of sepulture. But it appears that, on the triumph and supremacy of Christianity, the Roman Christians began in some degree and gra-

dually to disdain these secret and hidden places of rest for their dead. M. de Rossi states (we accept his authority from the epigraphs), that from A.D. 338 to 360 the proportion of burials was one-third above ground, two-thirds in the Catacombs. After the reign of Julian—

“The use of the subterranean sepulchres visibly declines; the numbers become equal. After 370 there is a sudden but not unexplained reaction. Magnificent churches began to rise over what were believed to be the burying-places of the Martyrs. But while the tomb of the Martyr was preserved inviolate, the altar being usually raised over it, the first or even the second floor was frequently levelled for the foundations and construction of the Church. Still the privilege of burial, as near as possible to the sacred and now worshipped relics of the Martyrs, crowded the crypts below, and subterranean interments in subterranean chambers under or close to the altar of the Martyrs came again into honour and request.”—*De Rossi*, p. 212.

Then came what we presume to call the fatal Pontificate of Damasus. This was a great epoch of change, or rather the height and, in one sense, the consummation of a change in Christianity. Among the signs of this change were the strife and frightful massacre at the election of Damasus—the degeneracy of the clergy, so vividly if darkly described in the well-known passage of the heathen Ammianus Marcellinus, confirmed by many passages in the writings of S. Jerome (these overcharged no doubt by the Saint's natural vehemence and passion for monasticism)—the dominance of that monasticism under the influence and guidance of Jerome. But nowhere was this change more marked than in the Catacombs. Through the irreverent reverence of Damasus, from hidden and secret chambers, where piety might steal down to shew its respect or affection for the dead, and make its orisons, which might tremble on the verge of worship; the Catacombs became as it were a great religious spectacle, the scene of devout pilgrimage to hundreds, thousands. They must be opened as far as possible to the light of day; the lucernaria (the light-shafts) were widened, spacious vestibules or halls were hewn out for the kneeling votaries; shrines, chapels, grew up; new and easy steps were made in place of the narrow and winding stairs. We suspect that in many cases the simpler works of art were *restored* (fatal word in art), brightened, made more vivid, and, as it was thought, more effective. What is worse, we are now in the full blaze or haze of legend. The utmost scope is given to the inventive and creative imagination; truth fades away, not from intentional repudiation, but because intenser devotion, and what was thought a much higher purpose than knowledge, edification, was the aim and purpose. There was an absolute passion for the multiplication of martyrs; and their lives, which had before been enveloped in a sober and holy twilight, came out into a dazzling glare of marvel—the more marvellous, the more admired and the more readily accepted as veracious. Read the Poems of Prudentius, which claim belief as real history. The mythic period, which lasted throughout the middle ages, and which still hovers undisturbed over its chosen sanctuaries, has now commenced. Pope Damasus was, as he esteemed himself no doubt, among the great benefactors, one of the most pious patrons, one who did most honour to and

sanctified most deeply the Catacombs of Rome. To us he was one of the worst offenders, the most real enemies to their inherent interest. Inscriptions, in letters of a peculiarly bold and square type, everywhere betray his presence and mark his operations. He aspired to be, in a certain sense, the Poet of the Catacombs. Some, from antiquarian motives, may regret the loss of very many of these flat hexameters : for us, who desire that the privileged and excusable mendacity of poetry should be compensated by some of its graces and harmonies, enough seems to have survived.

After the age of Damasus and his successors, the history of the Catacombs is brief, dark, and melancholy. Barbarians, Heathen barbarians, Christian barbarians, closed around Rome. Siege after siege; Alaric, Genseric, Vitiges, Totila, Belisarius, girt her walls with hostile hordes. Her suburbs lay waste; at least all the extramural churches, raised over the Catacombs, were at the mercy of the spoilers, who, if heathen, knew no reverent mercy, if Christian, at a later time, became perhaps more cruel enemies. Not only were the stately colossal monuments of republican or imperial Rome, which lined the Appian, Latin, or Flaminian Way, trampled as it were into ruin, made use of for military purposes, their materials knocked or hewn off for any base uses; but the Christian monuments, the churches, which rose above the Catacombs, perhaps the more accessible parts of the Catacombs, were exposed to insult, ravage, destruction. It was even worse with Christian invaders. The relics or supposed relics of saints and martyrs became a sort of *spolia opima*, which the victorious foe searched out with the keenest avarice, and carried off with the most devout triumph. If we remember right, the hated and heretical Lombards were most covetous of that pious plunder. Rome must now perforce submit to the desuetude, to the tacit abrogation of her ancient and venerable laws against intramural burial. The insulted or coveted saints and martyrs must retreat for security within the walls. Accordingly, at different periods, the more precious and sacred remains, those of St. Peter and St. Paul, for the second and third time, were transplanted to more secure sanctuaries. In intervals of peace the suburban and extra-mural sites of churches, built over the Catacombs, maintained the names of their, alas! no longer, tutelar saints. They were pointed out to and visited by a succession of pilgrims, M. de Rossi's friends, whose records he has made use of to so much advantage in his industrious inquiries.

We have left but narrow, we fear much too narrow, space for that most interesting subject, Christian Art, as preserved and exhibited in the Catacombs. Unhappily these investigations have, especially in late years, been conducted in a spirit which seems to us sadly polemic and controversial. For ourselves we must confess, though, as we trust, firmly attached to our own doctrines, that we look upon the results which have yet been obtained with utter indifference; on any which may transpire, with the calmest confidence. That member of a Reformed Church must be deplorably ill-instructed in the distinctive grounds of his faith who can feel the slightest jealousy and alarm. If indeed we

were to discover genuine documents concerning Papal infallibility, or even Papal supremacy,—if we were to read in distinct letters of that age any of the false Decretals; if the title-deeds to the temporal possessions of the Pope were to come to light; if any of the mediæval, or approximately mediæval, doctrines which separate Rome from us, were to be announced, as fully developed, and resting on irrefragable evidence,—we might be disposed to part from our friendly company with M. de Rossi, and to withdraw ourselves from his excellent and courteous guidance in these explorations.

We are bound, however, to justify our confidence, and are thus forced to enter upon one or two subjects, which we would willingly have avoided. We have read with care the very learned and remarkable essay, addressed by M. de Rossi to Dom Pitra, the editor of the *Spicilegium Solesmense* (now for his erudition and character justly promoted to the Cardinalate), on the famous symbol or emblem, the ΙΧΘΥΣ—'Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτήρ', pp. 545-584.

In this Essay (pp. 560, *et seqq.*) M. de Rossi describes some very curious pictures discovered in the cemetery of Callistus (of the age, he states, of the middle of the third century), evidently relating to the Holy Eucharist. We have ourselves seen, too hastily perhaps, these pictures. If M. de Rossi had not warned us (p. 360) that he was about to adduce something fatal to the new views on this subject, advanced in the 16th century, we should have read in unsuspecting innocence, and accepted the whole as a pleasing testimony to the profound reverence in which the Holy Eucharist was held by the earliest Christians. We have again read this part of the Essay with great care, and, for the life of us, can detect nothing, not the most remote allusion in the pictures themselves, or even in the interpretation of M. de Rossi, to which, we will not say, any high Anglican might not assent, but even all those likewise who in any way acknowledge any presence of Christ, spiritual or symbolical, in the Lord's Supper. The Fish, the divine Saviour, is in more than one way represented in juxtaposition to, or in a sort of parallelism with, the sacred elements. Here he is supporting a basket (*canistrum*) containing the bread, of a peculiar shape and colour, with what M. de Rossi supposes, with some subtlety, to signify or represent the wine. There the Fish appears with the bread and wine on a *table*. In another (a pendant, let us observe, to a painting clearly representing the Sacrament of Baptism) there is what seems a priest or bishop in the act of consecrating the elements, with a kneeling female, doubtless representing the Church. We must cite, though Latin, M. de Rossi's own words:—

"Jam quis dubitare possit ἰχθῦν, sive ille panem et vinum dorso sustinet, sive in mensâ cum pane positus, sive sub ipsâ consecrantis sacerdotis manu depictus est, Christum esse in eucharistiâ."

Here we pause, for M. de Rossi cannot or will not perceive, that as to the litigated question of the *nature* of Christ's presence, it stands precisely as it stood, in the mysterious vagueness in which it was left by our Saviour's words. Of the two main points of difference between

our Churches, the iteration of the *sacrifice*,—which we hold to have been made once for all, as “a sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction:” and the absolute transmutation of the elements, so that the bread and wine cease to exist,—of this materialistic change there is total silence, there is neither word nor hint. Indeed the symbolic character throughout would seem to favour those who interpret the whole symbolically. We must decline to follow M. de Rossi in some of his further speculations about the supper of Emmaus, into which, we think, that the more cautious divines of his own Church would hardly follow him.

The last publication on our list will perhaps still more have alarmed some of our readers; it has not in the least disturbed our equanimity. In this we must indeed express our regret that M. de Rossi again appears, and more avowedly, no longer as the calm and sober inquirer, and the candid and conscientious archaeologist, but rather as a thorough-going controversialist. We had rather meet him in amity in the former character; we cannot think that he is equally successful in the latter. He may convince those who are determined to be convinced, or are already convinced; we do not think that he will be held to have made out his case by a single sober or dispassionate inquirer. Though his Preface is more peaceful, M. de Rossi's almost ostentatious object, in his few pages (illustrated by very beautiful chromo-lithographic engravings, which do great credit to Roman art, but which seem to us almost, like the French work, too beautiful to be quite true), is to shew that the worship of the Virgin, in general supposed, even by the most learned in his own Church, as he himself admits, hardly to reach earlier than the second Council of Nicæa, is to be found *in initiate*, if not in full development, in the Catacombs of Rome; M. de Rossi would persuade us nearly in Apostolic times. We confess that we look on this question with greater indifference than may be pardoned by some of our more jealous brethren. At what time that holiest, most winning of human feelings, maternal love, appealed to the heart of the believer, kindled the imagination of the artist, and induced him to bring to life, as far as he could, in his speaking colours, or even to express in marble, the Virgin Mother and the Divine Child; at what particular period the solemn and devout affection, which hallowed every passage in the early Evangelic History, everything relating to the birth as well as the life of the Saviour,—how soon, and by what slower or more rapid degrees, respect, reverence, tender and devout interest, passed, imperceptibly no doubt, into adoration, worship, idolatry, till it culminated in merging as it were the Redeemer in his more powerful and more merciful mother, “*jure matris impera filio*;” till it added, literally, a fourth person to the Trinity:—

“Ante adventum Mariæ regnabant in cœlo tres personæ,

Alterum thronum addidit Homo Deus;”

—all this we hold it absolutely impossible to define with precise accuracy. Bolder steps may have been taken, at an earlier period, in

certain times, certain places, by certain persons of more fervent religious passion. We are silent on the greater change in our own days; when a revelation has been made to the holiness and wisdom of our contemporaries which was not vouchsafed to the piety of St. Bernard or the angelic theology of Thomas Aquinas.

But as to the works of art now before us, the few early pictorial representations of the Virgin, as dwelt upon by M. Rossi, they are of two kinds; one of the Virgin Mother with her Child in her lap, or on her bosom; the other as a female in the attitude of supplication, or as M. de Rossi would fondly believe, of intercession. As to the latter M. de Rossi is obliged, by that natural candour which he cannot shake off, to acknowledge that it may be no more than what it appears to our profane eyes, a female, possibly a martyr, or one of the faithful women in the attitude and act of adoration; or still more probably, an impersonation, by no means uncommon in the earliest periods, of the Church. But though M. de Rossi fairly admits all this, by some strange process of reasoning, because in some passages of the most poetical or metaphor-loving of the Fathers, the Church was represented as a Virgin, and by others an analogy drawn between the Virgin Mother and the Virgin Church, therefore he would assume that these are premature representations of the Virgin herself. So bold a conclusion from such scanty premises we have rarely known.

The former, the Virgin with the Child, are in truth simple Bible illustrations of the first chapters in the Evangelic History. In almost all it is the adoration of the Magi; it is the worship of the Child not of the mother. In one of these, that from the cemetery of Domitilla, the worshipping Magi are four. The theory that were three, though M. de Rossi cites many earlier instances, does not appear to have been rigorously established. The number, as we know, is not declared in the Gospels. Is it not probable that the three were settled in conformity with the three oblations? One, as we often see, bears the gold, another the incense, the third the myrrh, as the tribute of different Eastern nations. After all, may not the four be here, as M. de Rossi suggests, to balance and give symmetry to the design. On some sarcophagi, it may be added, appears the Child laid in the manger, in his swaddling clothes, with the mother near him, and the ox and the ass, once thought only to belong to later compositions, in mute adoration. No instance of this has been found in the catacomb paintings.

The adoration of the Magi appears again in a lunette of an arcosolio in the cemetery of St. Peter and S. Marcellinus. Here it is remarkable that the head of the Virgin is without a veil. This is supposed to indicate her virginity; as unmarried maidens did not wear the veil. In this there are only two Magi, looking much less kingly and less Oriental than in later art.

The third picture is the one which has been so often copied, from a lunette in an arcosolio in the cemetery of S. Agnese. This is familiar to all inquirers into ancient Christian art. It appears in Bishop Munter's "*Sinnbilder der alten Christen*;" who does not scruple to

recognize in it a representation of the Virgin. It represents a female with uplifted hands, as in prayer, with a child in her lap. But the style of art, verging towards the Byzantine, and other indications noted by M. de Rossi, especially the double monogram, which rarely appears before the unfolding of the Labarum by Constantine, clearly prove that this is the latest of the four paintings of the Virgin, and dates assuredly after the peace of the Church under Constantine.

There remains the first, on which M. de Rossi lavishes all his ingenuity, and indeed rests the whole strength of his case. It was found on the vaulting, over a "*loculo*" in the cemetery of Priscilla. The chromo-lithograph is of the size of the original. Another of these chromo-lithographs exhibits the whole vaulting with the other paintings which cover it, and deserves our serious attention. Half of the centre of this (of one half unfortunately the plaster has entirely fallen away and left no trace of the design) is occupied by the Good Shepherd carrying the lost sheep to the fold; the other two animals on each side of him are figured in relief of the finest white stucco, as is the trunk of the tree, of which the branches, foliage, fruit, and flowers are only painted. It seems to us rather a bold conjecture to suppose that the obliterated half of the picture represented the female, whatever she be or signifies, in the attitude of prayer, because this figure is more than once the "pendant" to the Good Shepherd. And M. de Rossi here cites a parallel case, which seems to us altogether at issue with his interpretation of the praying female. On a sarcophagus in the Lateran, which has the Good Shepherd balanced by the praying female, appears over the female the name IULIANE. Now as this was the name of the person deposited in the sarcophagus (as appears by an epigraph from her widowed husband) it is clear that in this instance it represents the departed wife, whose piety is thus imaged forth. To return: in another part, on the right-hand side, of the "*loculo*," there is a group to which a more commanding personage, almost obliterated, appears to point, of singular interest. The group consists of three figures; one a female in the attitude of prayer, with a long tunic and pallium; the second, a man in a short tunic and pallium, also with his arms uplifted as in adoration; the third a youth about ten years old,—this figure is less perfect. We at once made a bold conjecture, anticipating, we rejoice to say, the interpretation of M. de Rossi, as to the Scriptural scene here represented, the return from the visit to the Temple, where our Lord, at twelve years old, disputed with the Doctors. "*Behold thy father, and I have sought thee sorrowing.*" "*Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?*" Of the same size with this (the chromo-lithograph is that of the picture) is the important painting on which M. de Rossi dwells with such satisfaction. The Virgin Mother is seated with her Divine Son in her lap; above her, faint but still distinctly to be traced, is the star always seen in the representations of the Adoration of the Magi. In the front, to the left, is the figure of a man, youthful, with a few thin hairs on his cheeks, standing up, clothed only in a pallium, with his hands pointing at the star above the Virgin

and Child; he holds the volume of a book in his hand. Who can this represent? St. Joseph! That saint, though usually represented in later times as advanced in years, sometimes, as we are informed, appears as a beardless youth. But why the book? M. de Rossi suggests (and we accept his interpretation with hardly a doubt) that it represents one of the prophets of the Old Testament pointing at the star, and so signifying the fulfilment of prophecy. We had thought of Balaam; M. de Rossi inclines to Isaiah, and cites an authority for the prophet's youth in a glass ornament (*vetro*), described in P. Garrucci's curious work. There are not wanting pictures and sculptures which bear close analogy to this as a painting, described by Bosio, where the Virgin is seated before two towers, with a figure behind, which is supposed to designate the towers of Bethlehem where the child was to be born. Be this as it may, we have before us nothing more than what perhaps may not be strictly called a scene from the Evangelical History, but, as it were, a symbolic picture, founded on a real scene. It very nearly resembles those typical pictures so common in early Christian art; Jonah prefiguring the Resurrection, Moses striking the rock, in all which there is ever something more than a mere representation of the scenes in the Old Testament, ever a constant reference to their bearing on the Gospel. In short, we see no reason why the most scrupulous A Catholic, as by a courteous euphemism we are called in the preface to this work, may not gaze on this picture with as profound interest as the most devout worshipper of the Virgin. Of that worship, there is in the design not a shadow of a shade; the adoration is all centred on the child Jesus. Our own illustrated Bibles (Mr. Longman's or Mr. Murray's) may, without fear, transfer it to our pages.

The age of this picture M. de Rossi labours to raise, if not to that of the Apostles, to a period closely bordering upon it. It cannot at any rate be later than the Antonines. Into one of our author's arguments we fully enter. Its rare beauty shews a time when Roman art was yet in its prime, before it had begun to degenerate into that rude and coarse conception and execution which gradually, during the third and fourth centuries, darkened towards the Byzantine. We are the last to doubt that the accomplished student of early Christian art, with the countless specimens which are now multiplying around him, collected, and examined and compared with such eager and emulous zeal, may acquire that fine perception which can assign probable dates for their execution. Yet there must still be limits to this critical divination; some uncertainty will cleave to the soundest judgment. The individual artist may be later than his age, as he may be before his age. The sense of beauty and the skill, as they rose to precocious life, so may still linger in some chosen votaries.

Where the periods are defined, and marked by great names, each with his distinctive character; where the advance or degradation may be traced through numerous and undoubted examples, as in the history of Greek sculpture or Italian painting, we receive the decisions of the wise without mistrust. But it seems far more questionable, whether

any taste however sensitive, any knowledge however extensive, can peremptorily discriminate between the Flavian age and the age of the Antonines, or even that of the immediate successors of the Antonines, especially in Christian art, of which, after all, the examples are comparatively few, and far from perfect; and where the employment of Pagan artists may in some cases have continued longer, in others been sooner proscribed and fallen into desuetude.

But while we treat M. de Rossi's artistic argument with much respect, he must permit us to say that his historical argument for the antiquity of these paintings, however ingenious, seems to us utterly worthless. It rests on very doubtful legend, on the forced association of names, arbitrarily brought together. Our doubts would require more room than his statement, for every step in his reasoning seems to us liable to doubt; there is hardly an assumption which our critical spirit would grant; and the whole is as inconclusive as the separate steps.—*The Quarterly Review*, July, 1865.

Palestine Exploration Fund.—The following is a summary of the first report received from Captain Wilson, chief of the first expedition of this association, dated Damascus, December 20:—The party arrived at Beyrout at the end of November, and left it for Damascus on the 10th of December.—Astronomical observations have been obtained fixing the position of Beyrout, Mejd-el-Anjar, Baalbek, Surghaya, Suk Wady Barada, Damascus, Tell Salhiyeh, and Harran el-Awamid. The lakes east of Damascus were in course of exploration. Plans with detailed drawings and photographs have been made of the old temple at Deir el Kalah (near Beyrout), the temple at Mejd-el-Anjar, the old city of Chalcis, a small Greek church at Masi, the basilica of Theodosius at Baalbek (in the great quadrangle abutting on the western end of the great temple, the back of the apsis resting on the steps), the temple at Ain Fijeh, and the Roman gate at Damascus—Bab Shurky. The exploration of the Assyrian Mound at Tell Salhiyeh, near Damascus, had been commenced. A plan of the great mosque at Damascus, with photographs of details, was in course of execution. In addition to those above mentioned, careful photographs of a large size had been taken of various objects of interest along the road between Beyrout and Damascus; some of these for the first time. At Tell Salhiyeh and Harran el-Awamid inscriptions had been found apparently not hitherto known.

The second report is thus described by Mr. Grove:—"I have received a further report from Captain Wilson, Royal Engineers, in charge of the first exploring party of this association, dated Banias (Cæsarea Philippi), January 2. The party left Damascus on the 28th of December, and, travelling by S'as'a and Jeba, reached Banias on the 31st. They had very bad weather, with sleet and snow every day. The country between Jeba and Kuneiterah was half under water. *Topography.*—The positions of Damascus, Kaukab, Jeba (not marked on the maps), Banias, and the junction of the Hasbany and Banias rivers have been fixed astronomically, and the calculations made both for latitude and longitude. A reconnaissance sketch of the route from Damascus to Banias

has been made, shewing great discrepancies in the best maps. A reconnaissance sketch was in progress of the district round Banias to shew the junction of the three streams of the Jordan, and the course of the wadys near the town. The snow was, however, so thick and so low down as to prevent much being done in the wadys themselves. *Archæology*.—Plans have been made of the great Mosque at Damascus, of Bab Shurky (the Roman eastern gate), and of the Mount of Tel Salhiyeh. Excavations had been made in three places in the mound, but with no decisive result—except the discovery of one sculptured slab of a quasi-Assyrian character. The mound was originally formed of a compact mass of sun-dried bricks, with terraces, of which traces still remain. It is now much ruined, and the masonry has probably been used in the buildings at foot of the mound. Mr. Consul Rogers has undertaken to transport the slab to Beyrout, and the further exploration of the Tel will probably be undertaken by him. Photographs have been taken as follows:—Of the Mosque at Damascus (8), which, with those taken by Mr. Bedford at the Prince of Wales's visit, will afford a very good illustration of this remarkable edifice; of Bab Shurky, of the city wall opposite the tomb of St. George, of arch and pediment in book bazaar, of house in the city, of Banias from Wely Khudr, of niches and grotto, of the fountain head, of the castle from various points (5). The geology of the country passed through had been carefully observed and noted.

"It was intended to leave Banias on the 6th of January for Deir Mimas, at the bend of the Litâny, and thence to follow the ridge to Kedes; proceeding from Kedes, by Kefr Birim, Meiron, and Safed, to Tell Hum and Khan Minyeh, on the Lake of Galilee. This would give opportunity for surveying the ridge dividing the Hasbany and Litâny, and the district round Jebel Jurmuk and Safed, while excavations, plans, and photographs are being made among the ruins at Tell Hum. The health of the party was good."

The *Athenæum* says, "The third report from Captain Wilson adds to the evidence in favour of Tel Hum being the actual site of Capernaum. The White Synagogue has been dug about, and its plan and ornaments have been copied: there is scarcely any doubt that this edifice is the identical Greek synagogue built by the Roman officer. If so, it is one of the structures in which Christ actually prayed and taught—the only one now to be traced. The interest attaching to it is therefore of the most solemn kind. Khan Minyeh proves to be a modern mound. Actual observation is destroying all poor Robinson's 'improvements' on our sacred geography. Mr. Grove's account is this:—

"I have received a third report from Captain Wilson, R.E., in charge of the first exploring party of this association. The party arrived at Tel Hum (north-east end [read north-west.—Ed. *J. S. L.*] of the Lake of Galilee) on the 20th of January, moved to Khan Minyeh on the 25th, and to Mejdol (centre of the west side of Lake) on the 27th, at which date the report was despatched. *Topography*.—Astronomical observations have been made at Tel-el-Kady, Hunin, Kedes, Safed, Tel Hum, and Khan Minyeh. A reconnaissance sketch has been made of the district around

Banias down to the junction of the Banias and Hasbany rivers, across the valley to Mtleh, and thence following the dividing ridge between the waters of the Litány and Mediterranean and those of the Jordan down to Safen, embracing also a large portion of the country on either side. The bad state of the weather, cold and wet, drove the party from Kefr Birim; but they have to return to investigate the ruins there and at Meiron and Yarum, and other places not previously described, and will have an opportunity of getting in the topography of Jebel Jurmuk, and connecting it with the former work. A reconnoissance has been commenced of the country bordering on the lake, and this Captain Wilson hopes to carry right round, and also to trace out the whole of the Wadys running into the western side of the lake. *Archæology*.—A sketch has been made of the Castle of Hunin, the northern portion of which is surrounded by a ditch cut in the solid rock to a depth of, in some places, twenty feet, a work apparently of great antiquity. At Kedes some excavations were made on the site of the ruins. The western building is a tomb containing eleven *loculi*; the eastern one is a temple of the sun of about the same date as Baalbek; the richly-worked lintel over the main entrance was dug up. Close to the temple, and evidently belonging to it, an altar with a Greek inscription was found, which has been squeezed and copied; a finely-worked buried sarcophagus was dug up, in better repair than those exposed to the air. Detailed plans have been made of the mouldings, etc., on both the buildings and the sarcophagi, sufficient to reconstruct the former with great accuracy. On the same hill some curious tombs were found, of one of which a plan was made. A little more than two miles south-east of Kedes, on an isolated hill called Tel Harah, were found the remains of a large city of very ancient date; the walls of the citadel and a portion of the city wall could be traced. This Captain Wilson regards as the long-sought-for Hazor, in preference to Tell Khureibeh. At Tel Hum the White Synagogue had been so far excavated and its plan and ornaments carefully recorded, but nothing else had been found. The ruins of Chorazin at Kerazeh turn out to be far more important than was previously suspected; they cover a much larger extent of ground than Tel Hum, and many of the private houses are almost perfect, with the exception of the roofs; the openings for doors and windows remaining in some cases. All the buildings, including a synagogue or church, are of basalt, and it is not till one is right in among them that one sees clearly what they are; fifty or a hundred yards off they look nothing more than the rough heap of basaltic stones so common in this country. Drawings have been made of the mouldings, etc., and a plan of the large building as far as it could be made out. *Photographs*.—Two views of niches and fountain of Banias; seven views of castle of Banias; three views of town and citadel of Banias; one view of Hazor, Oak Grove; three views of sarcophagi at Kedes; one view of large tomb at Kedes; seven views of temple at Kedes; four views of ruins at Kerazeh; five views of ruins at Tel Hum. The broad cutting in the rock above Ain et Tin proves to be a portion of a large aqueduct which formerly conveyed the whole of the fountain at Tabighah into the plain of Gennesareth for irrigation; the water was raised in a tank and carried round the contour of the Tabighah valley to

the plain. The aqueduct still stands in small portions at several points, and can be easily traced the whole way by the number of stones with cement adhering to them lying on the surface of the ploughed fields. Specimens of the waters of the fountains have been kept, and their temperatures taken. At Irbid some progress had been made in excavating the synagogue. Two additional photographs had been taken; one of an aqueduct hewn in rock, and one of the plain from above Khan Minyeh. The reconnaissance had been advanced to Mejdal, and observations made at Khan Minyeh. The maps are all greatly in error in this district. The whole of the ancient system for irrigating the Ghuweir had been traced; though on a smaller scale, it was as perfect as that of the Damascus plain. The mounds at Khan Minyeh have been excavated for two days, but without much result. The pottery and masonry appear to be comparatively modern. The maps promise to be a valuable addition to the topography of Palestine.

Sydenham, Feb. 19, 1866.

GEORGE GROVE, *Hon. Sec.*

Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh invite attention to the Prospectus of a collection of all the works of the Fathers of the Christian Church, prior to the Council of Nicæa, to be edited by the Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D., author of *Discussions on the Gospels*, etc.; and James Donaldson, LL.D., author of *A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council*. In this Prospectus they observe that "the writings of the early Christians are allowed on all hands to be of great importance, and to be invested with a peculiar interest; and regrets have often been expressed that it should be so difficult to know their contents. Many of them are mere fragments; and where complete works exist, the text is often so corrupt, and the style is so involved, that even a good classical scholar is repelled from their perusal. If the student of Latin and Greek meets with obstacles, the merely English reader is absolutely without the means of information. The greater part of the most important writings have never been translated; and those translations which have been made are, with the exception of the few executed in recent times, for the most part loose, inaccurate, and difficult to procure. To supply this great want is the object of the Ante-Nicene Christian Library. All the Christian writings antecedent to the Nicene Council have been put into the hands of competent translators. These will make it their first and principal aim to produce translations as faithful as possible, uncoloured by any bias, dogmatic or ecclesiastical. They will also endeavour, in brief notes, to place the English reader in the position of those acquainted with the original languages. They will indicate important variations in the text; they will give different translations of the same passage where more than one have been proposed; they will note the various meanings attributed to the words in ecclesiastical controversies; and when the ancient documents appear in widely different forms, the various forms will be presented. At the same time, they will strive to combine with this strict accuracy and faithfulness as much elegance as may be consistent with the main aim. Short biographical and explanatory notices will be prefixed to each translation; and in every case where there

is variety of opinion, the writer will abstain from expressing his own sentiments, and confine himself simply to an impartial statement of the opinions of the most noteworthy critics on the point."

The following works are now being translated:—1. The Apostolical Fathers, including the Epistles of Clemens Romanus, the Epistles of Ignatius in their various forms, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle of Polycarp, the Epistle to Diognetus, and the Pastor of Hermas, with the Martyria of Ignatius and Polycarp.—2. The undoubted and doubtful works of Justin Martyr, the Apologies, the Dialogue with Trypho, the Oratio ad Gentiles, the Cohortatio, the De Monarchia, and the fragments on the Resurrection, along with the Martyrium of one Justin.—3. The works of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Hermias, and the fragments of the rest of the Apologists.—4. Irenaeus; all his extant works.—5. Clemens Alexandrinus: all his extant works.—6. Origen. The Series will include the De Principiis, and the Contra Celsum. The rest of his works will be translated if the Series is successful.—7. The fragments of Julius Africanus, and of the other writers given in Dr. Routh's *RELIQUIÆ SACRÆ*.—8. The works generally ascribed to Hippolytus, along with the recently discovered *Refutatio Omnium Heresium*.—9. The works ascribed to Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Methodius, and others of the same period.—10. The Recognitions and the Clementine Homilies, the Letters of Clemens on Virginité, the Constitutions, the Canons of the Apostles, Decrees of Councils till the period of the Nicene Council, and the Martyria written within the period, and generally believed to be genuine.—11. The Apocryphal Gospels, and other Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament.—12. The Octavius of Minucius Felix.—13. The entire works of Tertullian.—14. All the genuine works of Cyprian.—15. Arnobius adversus Gentes.—16. The works of Lactantius.—17. The extant works of Novatian, Victorinus, Commodianus, and other Christian Latin writers preceding the Council of Nice.

It is intended to include in the Series every Christian writing and document produced before the Nicene Council, whether in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Arabic, Æthiopic, or in any other language. The list includes a number of works, some portions of which are generally believed to have been written after the Council of Nice; but as other portions were, or may have been, written before that time, it has been thought the safer course to give them fully. Only those works which are now allowed on every hand to have been written after the Nicene Council, will be excluded.

It is believed that the writings comprised in the above Synopsis will form about sixteen or eighteen volumes, in demy octavo, to Subscribers four volumes for One Guinea. Each work will have a separate Index; and a very complete Index to the whole Series will be published in a separate volume, especial care being taken in its compilation. The Publishers' arrangements are such, that the publication, once commenced, will proceed very rapidly. We earnestly urge our readers to patronize this very important work.

Messrs. Clark have also issued a Prospectus of a condensed translation of Professor Carl Ritter's *Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*. In four volumes, demy 8vo. The Publishers say,—“Carl Ritter, the late

Professor of Geography in the University of Berlin, is known by name to many who are comparatively uninformed respecting the extent and value of his labours. In portraying the connection of geography with the physical sciences, Alexander von Humboldt had no superior, while in establishing the relation between geography and history, Carl Ritter was as unquestionably preeminent. A chair was created for him in the Berlin University as early as 1820. He lived to occupy it for forty years, and to confer no less honour upon the city where he resided, and the institution in which he taught, than upon his own name. And though but slight glimpses of his career have been caught by the people of Great Britain, yet such references to him as that in the Preface to Robinson's *Biblical Researches*, and works of a similar character, will convince the readers of this country that whatever comes from his pen must have great and permanent value. Professor Ritter's main work relates to Asia, and includes, therefore, all of that territory which is known as the Holy Land. To this, including the Lebanon district—Palestine proper—the country east of the Jordan, and the Sinaitic Peninsula, Ritter devotes a space equal to 6000 pages of the size employed in Messrs. Clark's publications. To translate a mass so voluminous as this would be evidently impracticable; and yet the immense erudition and power of graphic description of Professor Ritter, conjoined with the fact that he brought to the study of the Holy Land, not the unbelief of a rationalist, but the living faith of a genuine Christian, has convinced us that a portion of his great work would be a welcome offering to all students of Biblical Geography.

Messrs. Clark will accordingly publish, in the course of the present year, a translation executed by the Rev. William L. Gage, a pupil and friend of the lamented Ritter, comprising that portion of the volumes relating to the Holy Land, which, in his judgment as editor, shall be the most acceptable addition to our Biblical literature. The work will be comprised in four octavo volumes, and will be speedily put to press, it being now in an advanced state of preparation. Mr. Gage has been engaged for several years in the study and interpretation of Professor Ritter's writings, and has enjoyed the active cooperation of many of the most eminent living geographers."

Mr. Fry has published another valuable and handsome bibliographical curiosity: it is a description of six editions of Cranmer's Bible, and of five early folio editions of the Authorized Version. The work is illustrated with numerous perfect fac-similes, is upon paper made for the purpose, and each copy contains one original leaf of every edition described. We hope to give a full account of it in our next. Five pounds is not too much for so choice and unique a publication.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

~~~~~  
No. XVIII.—JULY, 1866.  
~~~~~

THE FRENCH ORATORIAN.—I. RICHARD SIMON.

THE *flâneur* who, on a fine summer's day, is tempted to idle along the Rue de Rivoli, will find on his left hand side, as he walks from the Place de la Concorde, a clerical-looking building, situated opposite the court-yard of the old Louvre, and to all appearances quite recently restored. That building is none else than the Oratoire, rendered illustrious in days of yore by De Bérulle, Bourgoing, Malebranche, and last, though not least, by the well-known critic and scholar, Richard Simon. It is the only remaining portion of a large establishment, which comprised all the usual appurtenances for a congregation of monks, together with a splendid library.* It is not our purpose on the present occasion to give the history of the *révérends Pères de l'Oratoire*, highly interesting though such a subject would certainly be; we want merely to put together, from the almost numberless pamphlets and volumes through which they are scattered, the principal details referring to the life and labours of Richard Simon. If the author of the *Critique du Vieux Testament*, and of so many other similar works, deserves to be called, "The Father of modern exegesis,"^b surely a short notice of him in *The Journal of Sacred Literature* is particularly appropriate; if, on

* See Lebeuf's *Histoire de la Ville et de tout le Diocèse de Paris*. Edit. of M. Cocheris, vol. i., pp. 97 and 182—186.

^b Expression of M. Renan.

the contrary, he is to be classed rather amongst those rash scholars who have perverted the science of criticism, and paved the way for modern rationalism, still it behoves us to know exactly what is his true position on the list of literati, and to see how he has obtained the unenviable notoriety which belongs to him.

We shall merely allude here to the earliest works of Richard Simon. Born at Dieppe, on the 13th May, 1638, he joined the congregation of the Oratoire at the age of twenty-one; and after having occupied the post of lecturer on philosophy at the college of Juilly, he returned to the Paris establishment, where he was engaged in cataloguing all the oriental manuscripts and printed books preserved there. His first literary production was a *factum*, which he composed on behalf of a Jew whom the Parliament of Metz had condemned in 1670 to be burnt, as guilty of having murdered a Christian child. The decision was set aside, and Richard Simon's endeavours seem to have chiefly brought about so happy a result. Several works, referring mainly to Eastern lore, appeared in succession between the years 1672 and 1675, making it quite evident that the young Oratorian was destined to establish for himself a very great reputation as a linguist and a critic. About that same time, the Protestant consistory of Charenton, near Paris, was endeavouring to carry out the often contemplated new version of the Scriptures; a reward of 12,000 livres had been offered to the best translator, and, at the suggestion of his friend Justel,^c Richard Simon turned his attention towards this laborious task; he went so far even, as to publish a sketch, or *projet*, stating the rules which he conceived should be adopted in preparing a trustworthy version; but the discouragements he experienced led him to abandon his original scheme. However, his labours on the sacred text, although not worked out according to the plan he had in the first instance conceived, were arranged in another shape, and in the year 1678 a Paris publisher announced the *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament, par le R. P. Richard Simon, de la Congrégation de l'Oratoire*.^d

“‘It is a long time,’ said Spanheim, ‘since I have read any book with greater diligence, so far as my other occupations allowed me leisure. And this I must ascribe to the selection of the matters discussed, to the order in which they are arranged, and to the manner in which the author explains himself. It was difficult, in my opinion, to perform his task better than he has done. We see at once that Father Simon has thoroughly mastered his subject, and has prepared his materials most

^c On Justel, see Messrs. Haag's excellent work *La France Protestante*, s.v.

^d Paris, veuve Bilaine, 4to. See Brunet, *Man. du Libraire*, s.v. SIMON.

assiduously. There is scarcely anything to be desired. He exhausts, so to say, the curiosity of the most attentive reader: nay, he even anticipates it, and relieves it. His book is a compendium of several volumes, or, rather, of an entire library. We even find there directions to make a select and judicious collection of works, because he gives us the catalogue of the various authors and editions, both of the Bible in all languages, and of its interpreters and critics of every religious persuasion. Finally, we have there an inexhaustible fund of information about several discoveries equally agreeable and new. The plan of the work is not only curious, but regular. We never lose sight of it; we follow it gradually, according to the precise order of subjects. This good order seems rather an effect of Father Simon's sound sense, and of the accuracy of his mind, than a method learnt at college, and borrowed from the rules of logic. But what delights one, perhaps, most is, that he never abandons his subject. There are no vain, useless, or tedious disquisitions. He instructs and entertains the reader without wearying him. He never makes a display of erudition out of place, far-fetched, or which does not seem perfectly familiar to him. His criticism—the greater part of it at any rate—has nothing confused, morose, captious about it. It is, on the contrary, full of frankness, honesty, and good faith. He does not appear enslaved by all the prejudices which characterize habitually persons of his own faith, and especially those belonging to a religious order. The judgments he passes upon authors are generally very accurate. *Tros Rutulusve fuat*, he gives to every one his due, and treats him according to his deserts. . . . He is clear even in the midst of the most thorny points of grammar. He judges Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and other Oriental authors without quoting from them in their own idioms, but merely giving the sense and substance of their opinions. So that, not only does he avoid those accumulated extracts, heaped up together in most cases indiscriminately and ill-advisedly, which is the stumbling-block of second-rate critics, but he spares to his reader the confusion in which such quotations generally throw him. His style is not overloaded with repetitions; it is neither florid nor affected, but easy and natural, such as the importance of the subject requires it. He says as much as is necessary to make himself understood, and no more. . . . In one word, Father Simon possesses discrimination, good sense, and erudition, besides candour, penetration, and justness. All this makes me long to see the second part of his work which he promises to publish, and which is to treat of the New Testament.”*

So glowing a panegyric, delivered by a competent judge, would lead the unsuspecting reader to suppose that Father Simon's *Hist. Critique du Vieux Testament* was a work without blemish, destined to prove of immense service to the Christian Church, and, accordingly, welcomed most enthusiastically by Catholics as well as by Protestants. And yet, what do we find as the real

* See Spanheim's *Lettre à un Ami*, in Reinier Leers' edition of the *Hist. Critiq.*, pp. 565—622.

state of the case? The champion of Gallicanism at that time was Bossuet; his decisions on matters of every kind connected with sacred criticism and with points of doctrine were considered as absolute truth, and naturally the Oratorian's quarto had to undergo his inspection before it could be finally published. Now the printing of the *Histoire Critique*, begun with a kind of mystery which excited suspicions, and, therefore, created prejudice against the author, was in April, 1678, nearly finished, and both the *Table of Contents* and *Preface* had just been struck off, when Chancellor Letellier, alarmed by some extraordinary statements they contained, directed that they should be forwarded to the prelate, in order that he might give his advice on the subject as soon as possible.^f "What was Bossuet's astonishment when, on running over the printed sheets, he discovered numerous summaries like the following one: 'Moses cannot be the author of all we find in the books which bear his name.' This was startling. The terrible censor continued to read with redoubled attention the preface, the remainder of the indexes; surprise, displeasure, took possession of his mind; and he soon became convinced that Father Simon had, with an amount of boldness which had never been equalled, endeavoured to refute the authorship of the books of Joshua, Samuel, Jeremiah, and Daniel. Not one of the assumed inspired writers had been able to stand the test of such criticism; and the composition of the books of the Old Testament was ascribed to Esdras, whom Richard Simon represented as having drawn them up about the time of the captivity, and after the destruction of the original documents. The summaries of each chapter were, besides, commented, developed, and interpreted by a preface, which rendered still plainer the character of the whole work."^g Bossuet was thunderstruck: the fact that the *Histoire Critique* had been composed by a member of the Oratoire was not calculated to quiet him, but rather to excite his indignation; and he exclaimed with a feeling of mingled wrath and sorrow,— "Les fidèles, abusés, comme le furent les Juifs, lorsque l'imposteur Alcime se fut insinué parmi eux pour les séduire, ne vont-ils pas dire à l'envi: un prêtre, un prêtre est venu à nous; il ne nous trompera pas, écoutons-le."^h In those days of despotic rule, when both king and prelate needed only to pronounce their *sic volo, sic jubeo*, it is almost astonishing that Bossuet should have condescended to suspend, even for a few days, the seizure

^f Cf. Bossuet, *Œuvres*, edit. of Dom Déforis, 4to, vol. x., pp. 506, and foll.

^g See M. Floquet's *Bossuet précepteur du Dauphin*, chap. viii., where the whole affair is minutely described, but in a ridiculously emphatic style.

^h Preface to his *Défense de la Tradition et des S.S.P.P.*, vol v., p. 1.

of the obnoxious volume. "The hours—what do I say, the minutes—were in this case of infinite value; the printing of the *Histoire Critique* was drawing to a conclusion, and what remedy could be applied to the evil when the work was once brought to light? Bossuet, however, deeming that, before everything else, the whole treatise must be read through, and appreciated attentively, decided that the publisher should receive orders not to send out till further orders any copy of the *Histoire Critique*, as it was immediately to be subjected to a searching examination, in consequence of which its fate would be finally settled. 'Car,' said he, 'il faut toujours tenter les voies les plus douces.'"¹

The reader must remark here that Richard Simon's work, like all others, had been banded over, when in MS., to a censor, without whose authorization no *imprimatur* could be given. The name of this official was Pirot, and certainly, if we consider the circumstances of the case, he must have been either extremely careless or extremely indulgent. Only fancy the unfortunate Pirot receiving back one morning the printed sheets of the *Histoire Critique* covered with irate annotations in pencil by the hand of Bossuet! It was as much as his situation was worth. He tried in vain to get out of the scrape by asserting, with an outburst of indignation, that he had been abominably deceived, and that he had given his approbation only on condition that certain corrections should be made in the text, corrections which Richard Simon, after all, had not introduced. Nay, more, if we believe poor Pirot, the heterodox critic had aggravated his delinquencies by even adding to the text (after it had been submitted to the censor) new matter, still bolder, still worse than the rest. Finally, however, Pirot was obliged to eat humble pie, and he acknowledged that he had given his approbation much too easily. Sainte-Marthe, then superior-general of the Oratoire, had likewise been deceived. Supposing that the approbation was delivered unconditionally, he had without any difficulty granted his own *imprimatur*, and, as a matter of consequence, the royal privilege followed in due course. But this is not all; and the extraordinary negligence displayed throughout the whole affair by those who were most concerned in it was so great that we can scarcely conceive it. Richard Simon seems to have been himself rather doubtful as to the fate of the *Histoire Critique*; and he thought that he would place beyond the range of discussion or suspicion the verdict of Pirot, that of Sainte-Marthe, and the privilege which had been the conse-

¹ *Letter to Malézieu*, May 19, 1702 Versailles edit., vol. xxxviii., p. 303.

quence. Two Jesuit fathers, viz., Lachaise, confessor of Louis XIV., and Verjus, promised to obtain from the king his acceptance of the dedication of the volume. The author's epistle presented to the monarch was approved of, printed, and, in short, the *Histoire Critique*, safely shielded from the fear of any attack,¹ was on the eve of publication. We thus see that neither Father Lachaise nor Father Verjus had read a line of the volume in question; and from this circumstance we may form some idea of the manner in which justice was administered under the reign of a prince "ennemi de la fraude," as Molière calls him, and whose especial boast was that he governed by himself. It was according to the same system of utter carelessness and indifference that sentences of death, of exile, and of imprisonment were passed upon the unfortunate Huguenots, and that Louis XIV. was made to believe in the absurd fiction of the conversion to Catholicism of the whole of France.

A kind of board was appointed by the king's orders to examine the *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*; notwithstanding his deplorable neglect and want of foresight, Pirot could not very well have been altogether superseded, because such a measure would have been tantamount to a decree of censure against the Sorbonne itself; but three other doctors, including Bossuet, were designated as his coadjutors, and the obnoxious volume was subjected to the most searching inquiry. Father Simon managed to obtain from the Bishop of Condon two private interviews, the former at Saint Germain, the latter at the Oratoire in Paris; and in the course of these meetings he succeeded, if we may believe M. Floquet, in exciting the interest of the prelate, who saw, with some amount of pain, a laborious and erudite priest threatened with a public censure, and, besides, condemned to heavy pecuniary losses, in consequence of the seizure of the volume in question. "Le Père Simon," said Bossuet, "n'a pas assez vu la conséquence de la doctrine qu'il enseigne dans son ouvrage." It was thought in the first instance, that a few alterations might be made to the book, which would entail a comparatively small expense, whilst, at the same time, they satisfied the claims of orthodoxy. Bossuet, however, soon perceived that almost every page required alteration, because the tendency of the whole work was "to destroy the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, under the pretence of establishing their authority upon the generally

¹ *Lettres choisies de M. Simon*, 1730, 12mo, vol. iv., pp. 57, and following.

² Bossuet's letter to the Oratorian father, De la Tour, April 16, 1678. Letter of Richard Simon to Father Dubreuil, April, 1679, amongst his *Lettres Choies*, 1730; 12mo, vol. iv., p. 52.

received traditions both of Jews and of Christians ;” in a word, the true system of the writer was “to nullify the authenticity of the canonical Bible.”¹ The *Histoire Critique* being thus found dangerous and full of errors, radically condemnable, and beyond the possibility of emendation, Richard Simon had nothing to do but to submit. In the meanwhile the congregation of the Oratoire was in a state of dismay, which can scarcely be imagined. Of course the unlucky Pirot, smarting under the very just remonstrances of Bossuet, was particularly anxious to find some plausible motive for glossing over and extenuating his own stupidity. He complained loudly that the Oratorian had thoroughly deceived him ; he was, he asserted, the victim “d’une indigne supercherie,” and it was for the reverend Fathers to state how they could have allowed one of their own body to send to press a work so entirely subversive of religion, so contrary to the uniform tradition of the Church. The Oratorians in their turn saw that the severe censure inflicted upon Richard Simon must likewise tell upon themselves, and that the numerous enemies of the community would eagerly catch at the circumstance with the view of injuring them in the opinion of the public. It was resolved accordingly that the guilty critic should be sacrificed for the benefit of the rest, and Sainte-Marthe, the Superior-General, after having publicly withdrawn the *imprimatur* which, he said, had been obtained from him by a kind of fraud, declared to Richard Simon that a sentence of exclusion from the congregation of the Oratoire was pronounced against him.

In the meanwhile the *Histoire Critique* was, as we have already said, undergoing thorough examination, and the decision of the board soon became known. Bossuet and his colleagues considering the pernicious results which would be sure to follow if the bulky volume were published, insisted upon the suppression of the whole edition ; the council passed a decree conformable to this opinion, the destruction of the extant copies was ordered, and all booksellers and publishers were strictly prohibited from reprinting the work under any pretence whatever. The *Commissaire de Police*, Nicolas de la Mare, had to carry out the decree, and, except seven or eight copies, the work was in its first shape utterly annihilated.* Huet, Bishop of Avranches, who was always very eager to collect curiosities and rarities of

¹ See Lédieu's *Journal*, vol. ii., p. 41.

* Bossuet's Letter to Bertin, May 27, 1702. Versailles edit., vol. xxxviii., p. 317.

* Quérard, in his *France Littéraire*, s.v. Simon, vol. ix., p. 158, says that eight copies were saved. Barbier (*Dict. des Ouvrages Anonymes*, edit. 1823, vol. ii., p. 65, No. 7334) names only six.

every description, managed to procure one of these stray waifs ; it is now preserved in the Paris imperial library,^o and is particularly valuable, on account of some manuscript marginal annotations in the handwriting of the original possessor. "M. Simon," says Huet, "a de l'esprit, de la pénétration, du discernement, les connaissances nécessaires pour bien traiter la matière ; en un mot les talents propres à faire un bon critique, si le jugement y repondait." This note is only one of the numerous expressions of opinion uttered by the Bishop of Avranches respecting the heterodox Oratorian, whom he reproached elsewhere for having taken a delight "à étendre, à amplifier, à exagérer des choses hasardées, avant lui, par d'autres qui, eux au moins, s'étaient exprimés avec plus de retenue, de réserve et de mesure."^p Accustomed as we are now to the critical vagaries of the German commentators, and to the startling views of Dr. Colenso, we can scarcely understand the extraordinary sensation produced by the work of Richard Simon. Yet it is quite true to say that the *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* contained in germ all the theories that have been developed subsequently by a more scientific school of rationalism, and the recent discoveries made in the various departments of archæology and of comparative philology have only served to throw the garb of erudition around the statements brought forward two hundred years ago by the daring Simon. The interference of the civil power in this affair is one feature which, from our own point of view, seems not only uncalled for, but particularly unfair ; but we must remember what were the ideas prevailing during the seventeenth century respecting the connection between the Church and the State ; we must especially bear in mind that Protestants as well as Catholics were at that time thoroughly imbued with absolutist ideas, and that Jurieu lacked only Bossuet's position to be as arbitrary, as despotic as the Bishop of Condon himself. The destruction of the *Histoire Critique* proved, besides, a signal blunder ; if only one single copy had escaped, even then the result of the *Commissaire de Police's* razzia would have been defeated ; but we have just seen that six *exemplaires* at least survived, and, next to Pirot's stupidity, we are left to admire the want of circumspection displayed on this occasion by the agents of *le Grand Monarque's* inquisition.

We must now give our readers, as briefly as we can, a view of the line of argument maintained by Richard Simon in the *Histoire Critique*, and thus enable them, in a certain measure, to

^o In 4to, A, 2276, A.

^p *Huetiana*, Paris, 1722, 12mo ; see also Dan. Huetii epist. Joanni Georgio Grævio, xv kal. Maii, 1679. (*Dissertationes recueillies par l'Abbé de la Marquelladet*, 1710 ; 12mo, vol. ii., p. 360.)

form their own opinion respecting the merits or demerits of the work. The volume itself is divided into three books; the first contains a discussion of the Hebrew text from the time of Moses; the second gives an account of the several versions, both ancient and modern, of the Old Testament Scriptures; and the third supplies a series of rules for the drawing up of a new and improved translation. Simon's starting axiom is that the Hebrew text has been corrupted to a very considerable extent, and that the one we now have by no means corresponds to the original Scriptures, such as the Jews possessed them. "It is absurd," he adds, "to suppose that Moses was the exclusive author of the Pentateuch; the laws and precepts are the only part of the book which can, with any amount of probability, be ascribed to him; as for the narrative portions, they are the work of certain scribes, who were called also prophets, and who committed to writing not only a considerable portion of the Pentateuch, but nearly all the other historical books of the Old Testament, properly so called." From this short summary, we see at once what a heavy blow Richard Simon struck at the authenticity of the sacred text; the door was flung open to the widest scepticism, and Spinosa found—strange to say—his own loose views strengthened and endorsed by the learning of a Christian priest.[†] The question then naturally suggests itself: if such an amount of uncertainty prevails respecting the Hebrew original of the Bible, how do we know that our Scriptures are trustworthy, and that we are not, after all, building up both our doctrine and our rules for conduct upon a volume which has no authority whatever? Here Richard Simon flies for refuge to the great Roman Catholic principle of tradition, and he maintains that the Church alone is the real guarantee for the Scriptures.[‡] At first sight it seems as if such an assertion should have secured for the *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* a favourable reception amongst Richard Simon's fellow-religionists, and, indeed, Bayle makes, in his *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, a remark to that purpose: "Cet ouvrage," says he, "semble extrêmement favoriser l'Eglise Romaine dans les disputes que lui font les Protestants sur l'autorité de la tradition. C'est ce qu'ont fort bien reconnu plusieurs savants hommes d'Italie, car on a vu à Paris plusieurs lettres écrites de Rome qui marquoient, qu'à la réserve d'un petit nombre de choses de peu d'importance, cette critique de M. Simon y avoit été trouvée très judicieuse, d'un profond

[†] See, for allucid résumé of the whole subject, Walchius' *Bibliotheca Theologica Selecta*, vol. iv., pp. 250 and following. Edit. 1775.

[‡] Puisqu'on ne peut soutenir sans entêtement que l'Ecriture soit claire, il faut que la tradition soit notre ressource.

savoir et tout à fait conforme aux véritables principes de l'Eglise Romaine." But if we think for a moment, we shall see that whatever authority is allowed to tradition, there must be something solid for tradition to work upon; the fact, the person or the book respecting which traditional evidence is adduced and accepted, must be perfectly well authenticated, placed beyond the reach of dispute; and the part of tradition consists, not in creating the subject-matter of the argument, but in shewing, by a continuous train of witnesses, that that subject-matter has always existed under certain conditions and amidst certain circumstances. Thus M. de Lamennais, in his *Indifférence en matière de Religion*, starts also from the principle of tradition, and attempts to shew that the *consensus generalis* is the only test of truth; but, at the same time, he does not begin by assuming that all religions are uncertain, and that tradition alone can enlighten us as to our real position with regard to God; he assumes that God having created man, there must of necessity be some relations between man and his Maker; these relations constitute what is called religion; and the only point which remains to be ascertained is this: what form of religion amongst the many ones between which mankind is divided, accounts most satisfactorily for these relations? Bossuet had too much common sense not to perceive that the Oratorian's appeal to tradition was futile, and that, besides its misapplication in the present instance, it was calculated to furnish the Protestants with admirable arguments against the pretensions of Roman Catholicism.⁴

It is quite certain that the *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* was a very mischievous work; but at the same time it displayed an amount of learning which was not by any means common then; and, as Walchius observes, it contained some parts of real value." We may name especially the remarks on the Latin translations of the Bible, and nearly the whole of the third division of the book treating of the rules which those should observe who aim at giving a new version of the Scriptures.

As we have already said, the first edition was almost entirely destroyed; but Richard Simon managed to get a copy sent over to England, and from it Elzevier published in Holland a reprint, which, however, was disfigured by the grossest blunders. The

⁴ Artic. XI. for December, 1684, p. 191 of the fo. edition.

⁵ Les Protestants ne seront pas fâchés que l'Eglise Romaine donne cours à cet ouvrage, parcequ'ils en prendront sujet de se vanter qu'ils sont les seuls défenseurs de l'intégrité et de l'incorruptibilité de la parole de Dieu. Bayle, *Nouv. de la Répub. des Lettres*.

⁶ Multa a Simone dicta sunt quæ utilitatem adferunt et laudari debent. *Biblio. Theol.*, iv. 252.

Latin translation made by Aubert de Versé was worse still, and an English version, mentioned in biographical dictionaries, is described as full of ridiculous Gallicisms. It was in the year 1685 that the bookseller Reinier Leers gave to the public the best edition of the celebrated volume; a curious preface, an ingenious apology, marginal notes, and the collection of the pamphlets which had appeared on both sides of the question were added, giving to the whole volume an unusual amount of interest, and rendering absolutely futile all the precautions of the French government. Every *savant* managed, of course, to get a copy; and those readers who did not care to study the work itself, could turn to the summary given of it by Bayle, in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*,^v for December 1684. Ezekiel Spanheim's strictures on the *Histoire Critique* have supplied us previously with a long quotation; of that work Walchius observes, "Nec sine caussa adfirmavit, gravas Simonis sententias ita comparatas esse, ut illæ ad fundamenta totius religionis Christianæ labefactanda valeant;" and yet other critics accused Spanheim of being really favourable to the Oratorian;^w but answers, refutations, pamphlets, disquisitions were poured out thick and fast, both from Roman Catholics and from Protestants. Du Veil, Vossius, Leclerc, Levassor, Colomiès, Carpzovius, Ellies du Pin, with a host of subaltern scribblers, rushed into the middle of the fight, and all aspired to have their fling at the unlucky critic. Referring our readers to the catalogue given by Walchius^x and by Nicéron,^y we shall merely glance here at some of the leading episodes in this celebrated contest.

The position of Jean Leclerc, as one of the representatives of French Protestantism abroad, was extremely curious, and for any person less gifted with assurance than he was, it would have been very difficult to maintain it. He shared, in the first place, with his fellow-*réfugiés*, the animosity of the Roman Catholic clergy in his native country, and the attacks directed against them by Bossuet, Pellisson, and others, were aimed at him likewise. Then, in addition to these enemies, he had also to cope with the violent Jurieu, who having constituted himself the chief maintainer and champion of Calvinist orthodoxy, regarded as the worst enemies of the Christian faith Arminians like the learned

^v See also the *Acta Eruditorum* for 1686, and Leclerc's *Bibliothèque Universelle*, vol. iii., p. 99.

^w Le livre de M. Spanheim contre le P. Simon ne plait point du tout; on trouve qu'il fait plutôt son apologie que sa censure. Bayle, *Lettre à M. Minutoli*, p. 576 of the 4th edition.

^x *Biblioth. Theolog.*, vol. iv., pp. 255–7.

^y *Mémoires pour Servir*, etc., vols. i. and x.

editor of the *Bibliothèque Universelle*. A courageous and uncompromising advocate of freedom of thought, the decided enemy of intolerance and absolutism,* Leclerc, one would imagine, must have, at least, agreed with the arch-sceptic Bayle. But no; such was the fondness for dispute then prevalent among the learned—such was the obstinacy with which each one held to his own opinions, that Leclerc, in his refutation of Father Simon, had to stand the galling fire not only of the Oratorian, but also of the Protestant journalists and critics. He published, in 1685, at Amsterdam a work entitled *Sentiments de quelques théologiens de Hollande sur l'Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*, and Simon having answered that volume, he thought proper to issue a counter-reply, or *Défense des Sentiments de quelques Théologiens de Hollande*. It is curious to see a divine who takes up his pen in defence of orthodoxy, himself accused of entertaining opinions contrary to the Christian faith; and yet that is precisely what happened to the Arminian Leclerc. M. Leclerc is a ranter; M. Leclerc knows nothing about Rabbinical literature; M. Leclerc talks rashly respecting the Fathers of the Church, etc., etc. Such are the headings of some of the chapters in Father Simon's *Réponse à la défense*, and we are not astonished at finding them there; but only think of a paragraph summed up in the following words: "*M. Leclerc a traité Moïse d'une manière injurieuse!*" The Catholic priest had merely (though that was quite enough) said that Moses was not the author of the whole Pentateuch; but behold a professor of divinity calmly asserting that the lawgiver of the Jews was an ignorant man, and plunged in all the superstitions of idolatry! Richard Simon was far too clever not to take advantage of the false position in which Leclerc stood, and not to represent him as the *bête noire* of Protestantism; his *Réponse aux sentiments*, and his *Réponse à la défense*, are written in somewhat of a rabid style, but they seem to us perfectly conclusive against Leclerc. Then, what did the Protestant Churches think of the spokesman of the "Holland theologians?" "M. Leclerc," says Bayle, "has just written a book against M. Simon; there are good things in it, but too bold. You should warn him that instead of doing good to the party with which he has identified himself, I mean the Arminians, he will only render them more hated, for it will merely confirm people in the opinions generally entertained here that all Arminians are Socinians, to say the least."^a And elsewhere: "M. Leclerc distinguishes himself daily by his boldness in pub-

* *La France Protestante*, s. v. Leclerc.

^a Bayle, *Lettre à M. L'enfant*, p. 619.

lishing heretical opinions, and in condemning the authors who do not please him."^b "If you wish to preserve the friendship of M. Leclerc, you must mind what you are about, for he gets easily angry, and never forgives. He is always declaiming against the *odium theologicum*, and does not reflect that he is drawing his own portrait."^c In fact, Leclerc was the *alter ego* of Richard Simon in his fondness for controversial disputes and the irritability of his temper. Besides his discussions with the Oratorian on the subject of the Old Testament, he was opposed to Cave respecting the authority of the early Fathers; to Martianay, about Saint Jerome, and to Van der Wayen concerning the meaning of John i. 8. He disputed with Bayle on plastic forms and on Manicheism;—with the Jesuit Baltus on the Platonist opinions of the Fathers;—with Andala on the essence of the soul;—with Witsius on the inspiration of Scripture;—with Walchius on the *Logos*;—with Burmann, Perizonius, Bentley and Boileau on merely literary topics.

Vossius is another of Father Simon's most distinguished adversaries. The sore point here was the merits of the Septuagint version, which the canon of Windsor rated very high in opposition to the French critic. In his *responsio ad objecta nuperæ critica sacra*, he maintained that the seventy interpreters were gifted with the spirit of prophecy, and he defended, against Simon, certain passages which had been criticised in the *Histoire Critique*. Without going into all the details of this controversy, we shall just say that Richard Simon attacked not only the opinions of Vossius respecting the Septuagint, but also his scholarship generally. The discussion was maintained on both sides with a great deal of spirit, and in this case the author of the *Histoire Critique* had the honour of having as an adversary a far greater man than Jean Leclerc.

When we read of all these quarrels, all these angry publications about points of erudition, we are, at first, astonished at the noise they excited and the attention bestowed upon them. We almost wonder that Europe should have been turned into a kind of battle-field, where the knights were doctors of divinity, the weapons, dictionaries, and the subjects of dispute, the authenticity of a text. But we must remember that, during a time when political topics could not be freely handled, when parliamentary debates were almost unknown, and the people at large enjoyed no right in the administration of affairs, the discussion of literary and metaphysical questions was the only means of asserting the principle of free thought, of supplying

^b *Lettre à Minutoli*, p. 625.

^c *Ibid.*, p. 626.

food for intellectual activity, and of enabling men to bear with less reluctance the pressure of a despotic government.

The *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* was followed in 1689 by the *Histoire Critique du Nouveau Testament*. After his disgrace Richard Simon had retired to a living he held at Boleville, in Normandy; but so quiet a style of life as that of a country *curé* could not suit him, and after the short space of two years he resigned his duties, in order that he might once more come to Paris and resume his literary engagements. The *Histoire du Nouveau Testament* met with the most favourable reception from the learned part of the community, and certainly it does not shock us by the same amount of startling paradoxes which are to be found in the previous work. At the same time Richard Simon still upholds the supreme authority of tradition, and he quotes on that subject the evidence of Saint Augustine, who, writing to Faustus, challenged him to produce, on behalf of his heretical teaching, books having for them the sanction of universal tradition. "Quid ages? Quo te convertes? Quam libri a te prolati originem, quam vetustatem, quam seriem successionis testem citabis?"^d And a little further on the Bishop of Hippo continues: "Vides in hac re quid Ecclesiæ Catholicæ valeat auctoritas, quæ ab istis fundatissimis sedibus Apostolorum usque ad hodiernum diem succedentium sibi met Episcoporum serie et tot populorum consensione firmatur." The critics on the Protestant side who handled the *Histoire du Nouveau Testament*, whilst they approved Simon's diligence in appealing to written texts and documents on the subject of the Scriptures, remarked very aptly that it was a great pity such a method should not be universally followed by the Roman Catholic Church in matters of controversy. For then we should not always be required to give up what is called our private judgment, and to bow down before the infallible authority of the Church. Such or such a point is mooted, such or such a difficulty raised; well, our adversaries would say, here are the acts, here are the documents upon which we establish our decision, and all Christians are bound to accept them if it can be proved that the doctrines they teach are agreeable to those inculcated by the Apostles and their immediate successors. An admission like that would, no doubt, simplify in the highest degree the debate between Protestants and Catholics; but would it be countenanced by the real, faithful, staunch adherents of the Pope, those, for instance, who maintain the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception?

Richard Simon, we must add, after having said that authentic

^d Aug., lib. 11, cont. *Faust.*, cap. 2.

documents are the only basis of the decisions of the Church, soon perceives that he has laid himself open to a charge of inconsistency as a member of the one infallible *ecclesia*, for he says^e that even if the Apostles had written nothing, we should still be obliged to believe the Church; an assertion which is tantamount to say that, even if there were no written documents, we should still be bound to believe that the Church has preserved, and for ever held fast, the doctrines of the Apostles. Such an assertion, if it were true, would, as it is easily perceived, render the Holy Scriptures a mere useless collection of writings, having no value whatever, and admitted only as supplying a kind of superabundant evidence, which could always be upset, when necessary, by the *consensus generalis*. "Jesus Christ," says Richard Simon, "avoit envoyé ses disciples à toutes les nations de la terre, seulement pour prêcher sa doctrine.^f . . . Les Apôtres avoient reçu ordre de Jesus Christ de prêcher son Evangile, et non de composer des livres."^g True; but, in the first place, if the Apostles had received no command to write books, neither had they been prohibited from doing so; and, further, we should like to know whether the earliest appeal made in favour of tradition had no reference to the distinct teaching of our Lord and his disciples; and how could that teaching have been known unless through the medium of written documents? We do not think that any Roman Catholic doctor, except Richard Simon, has ever been bold enough to assert that the infallibility of the Church (supposing it recognized, for the sake of argument,) can be apparent except when applied to the interpretation of texts which are to constitute our rule both of faith and of practice. If, notwithstanding the inspired Scriptures, some heretics were able to pass off their false teaching as being part of the Gospel of Christ, what would have been the result on the supposition that we had no Scriptures at all to appeal to? Besides, the command given by our Lord to his Apostles to preach the Gospel to all nations must necessarily imply written as well as oral teaching, unless we are prepared to admit a rapidity of communication which would border upon the miraculous. It is on the part of Father Simon the most childish spirit of cavil that leads him to limit the sense of the word *preach* to actual speaking. We can, likewise, remark with Leclerc,^h that the true meaning of the passage in Saint Matthew's Gospel, οὐκ ἦλθον καταλύσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι (v. 17), is directly opposed to Father Simon's theory; for if we took the verb

^e *Ibid.*, p. 37, col. 2.

^f *Ibid.*, p. 37, col. 2.

^g *Ibid.*, p. 36, col. 1.

^h *Bibliothèque Universelle*, xii., 411.

Πληρῶσαι as meaning strictly and exclusively to fulfil in the sense of to accomplish, to perform, we should have to adopt all the Mosaic ceremonies, and to suppose that our Lord's mission consisted chiefly in explaining the Old Testament to the Jews, "comme un simple Rabbin." Most of the Fathers of the Church, however, and of the best commentators (Leclerc quotes Hammond and Grotius), agree that *Πληρῶσαι* means *to supplement, to perfect*, that which was deficient in the law. Now it was not less necessary to write down the additions and supplements which our Lord made to the law than the law itself, although God expressly commanded that the law should be taken down in writing, whereas there is no distinct command of an analogous nature with reference to the Gospel. But in a case like the one now under consideration there was no need whatever of an express command, and we could very well understand how necessary it was that the law should be written, even though there should be no positive direction on the subject.¹ The necessity of tradition is Father Simon's hobby, and rather than give it up he commits grammatical blunders. Quoting, for instance, the *Synopsis totius Scripturæ*, ascribed to Saint Athanasius, he says: "L'Evangile selon Saint Marc a été prêché à Rome par Saint Pierre (Τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγέλιον ὑπηγορεύθη μὲν ὑπὸ Πέτρου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ)." In another place² he translates, Τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον ὑπηγορεύθη μὲν ὑπὸ Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου, "L'Evangile selon Saint Luc a été prêché par Saint Paul." Elsewhere, again, he talks of the Gospel preached by Saint John in the island of Patmos, thus completely mistaking the sense of the verb *ὑπαγορεύειν*.

The question of the inspiration of Holy Scripture was, of course, too important not to engage the attention of the learned Oratorian, and he accordingly devotes to it three chapters. Reproducing here the view which he had already stated in his answers to the *Sentiments de quelques théologiens de Hollande*, and in his *Traité de l'Inspiration des livres sacrés*, he reduces the inspiration of the New Testament to a special care taken by Providence lest the Apostles should fall into any mistake. This is, as we see, allowing just the most trifling minimum of interference on the part of the Almighty for the preparation of the sacred record.³ But here the question occurs whether that interference has applied itself to verbal details, or merely to the general economy of religion. Now, on this point, Richard Simon preserves a somewhat suspicious, and, certainly, very

¹ Leclerc, ubi suprâ. ² *Ibid.*, p. 105, col. 2. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 123, col. 1.

⁴ See chaps. xxiii., xxiv., xxv.

provoking, silence; merely quoting [the views of Holden and De Dominis, who maintained the partial inspiration of Scripture.* And it is somewhat singular that, whilst alluding to the views held by these two doctors, without expressing any opinion about them, he should, at the same time, attack both Grotius and Leclerc, who, nevertheless, held exactly the same doctrine. Although, however, we cannot quote Father Simon's *ipsissima verba* on the fundamental question of inspiration, we may be permitted to conclude, inferentially, that he was not what would be considered as strictly orthodox, from the approbation he gives to the sentiments held by the Louvain Jesuits. These divines having maintained at their college, in 1586, a series of propositions on Predestination, Divine Grace, and the authority of the Scriptures, these propositions were condemned as *peregrina, offensiva et periculosa dogmata*, and amongst others the three following, which we think best to transcribe such as they are to be found in the *Histoire Critique du Nouveau Testament*.

1. Ut aliquid sit Scriptura Sancta, non necessarium est singula ejus verba inspirata esse a Spiritu Sancto.

2. Non est necessarium ut singulæ veritates et sententiæ sint immediatè a Spiritu Sancto ipsi Scriptori inspiratæ.

3. Liber aliquis, quasi fortasse est secundus Macchabæorum, humanâ industriâ sine assistentiâ Spiritûs sancti scriptus, si Spiritus Sanctus postea testetur ibi nihil esse falsum, efficitur Scriptura Sancta."

Such are the three assertions respecting which Father Simon says: "They seem agreeable to common sense, nor are they even contrary to the theology of the ancient fathers, whom we should rather consult on that subject than the *holy theological board of Louvain* (*La sacrée faculté de théologie de Louvain*).

We must hasten now to notice the *Histoire Critique des Versions du Nouveau Testament*, which was published in 1690.^o Richard Simon fancied that Antoine Arnauld, the celebrated Jansenist, had had some share in procuring the condemnation of the *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*; he determined,

* Auxilium speciale divinitus præstitum auctori cujuslibet Scripti quod pro verbo Dei recipit Ecclesia, ad ea solummodo se porrigit quæ vel sint purè doctrinalia, vel proximum aliquem aut necessarium habeant ad doctrinalia respectum. In iis verò quæ non sunt de instituto Scriptoris, vel ad alia referuntur, eo tantum subsidio Deum illi adfuisse judicamus, quod piissimis cæteris auctoribus commune sit.—Holden, *Div. fid. Annal.*, lib. 1, c. 5. Non omnia quæ in Scripturis continentur esse simpliciter et absolutè objectum nostræ fidei, seu spectare ad articulos fidei: sola enim revelata sunt objectum fidei, ac non omnia quæ Scriptura habet, docet aut narrat, sunt revelata. De Dominis, lib. vii., cap. 1.

¶ See *Histoire Critique du Nouv. Test.*, pp. 179, 180.

¶ 1 vol. 4to. Rotterdam, published by Reinier Leers.

therefore, to pay him off by cutting up the translation of the New Testament known as the Version de Mons, and which was the work of Messieurs de Port Royal. There is no doubt that the translation in question was not a very good one, but Richard Simon managed to find fault with it from beginning to end; and the evident gusto with which he drags every blunder before the public, shews that in this instance he was chiefly actuated by spite. He opens fire in his preface. "It is astonishing," says he, "that Messieurs de Port Royal, who say they have forgotten nothing to give a good version of the New Testament in our language, should have so ill succeeded. I here express myself in far greater detail upon their version than upon others, because it is in everybody's hands. Yet I have only enumerated part of the errors I discovered. If they had been exact, they would have consulted persons more competent than themselves respecting the meaning of several expressions which refer to the arts, and which they have not understood. The 27th chapter of the Acts alone is a signal proof of their ignorance."

Leclerc gives, in one of his journals, a long enumeration of the critiques addressed by the Oratorian to the Jansenists, as translators of the Bible;² these objections amount to sixteen, of which we shall just mention the principal one. It is well known that the opinions of the Port-Royalist divines on the subject of predestination and of divine grace are exactly those of Calvin;³ Jansenism, in fact, is nothing else but a kind of badly concealed Protestantism,⁴ and the Jesuits know this perfectly well. Hence the strong feeling of indignation with which all the Port-Royalists spoke of the Reformation of the sixteenth century; they seemed constantly afraid lest they should be mistaken for Huguenots; and whilst they found it quite impossible to refute the accusation of quasi-heresy directed against them, they never lost the opportunity of asserting strenuously their pretended orthodoxy as members of the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, to throw out a hint respecting their Calvinism was always to annoy them in the highest degree, and Richard Simon did not forget this.

"Very far from its being the fact," he says, "that all learned men are favourable to Messieurs de Port-Royal in the passages where they forsake the old Latin edition to follow the Greek, I believe, on the contrary, that they will be shocked at seeing it abandoned, in Mark iii. 16,

² *Bibl. Universelle*, xvi., 49—84.

³ Les raisonneurs de Calvinistes,
Et leurs cousins les Jansénistes.—*Voltaire*.

⁴ See de Maistre's *De l'église Gallicane*, chaps. iv., v.

for Beza and the other ministers of Geneva. They have translated in that passage the text by *le premier fut Simon*, like the Protestants. However, the word *le premier* is to be found neither in the Latin nor in any Greek MS. of those that have reached us, although they are numerous. The Mons translators acknowledge that they are indebted to Beza for the correction. They say in their note, 'C'est le sens le plus naturel, et ce que portent quelques exemplaires Grecs que Bèze même a suivis.' As I do not follow the profession of a controversialist, I shall not stop to inquire whether that Calvinist did try to throw by his translation some doubt on the primacy of Saint Peter. It is enough if I prove that he was wrong in not following in this passage the Greek text such as all the MSS. present it; and, further, that Messieurs de Port-Royal are still more guilty for having translated from the Latin. I can even affirm boldly that, with the exception of the Genevese doctors, men calculated to judge in such matters are not on their side."^a

It is rather annoying for serious persons like the Jansenists to find themselves accused of tampering with the text of Scriptures in order to procure the highest sanction for certain peculiarities of doctrine, and that affront was offered to them by Richard Simon.

"These gentlemen," says the Oratorian, "have been accused likewise of adding in their translation the word *efficace*, which they thought they could see in the Greek, in order that the New Testament might be represented as inculcating the doctrine of *efficacious grace*. But on this point they have answered that their adversaries are so opposed to *efficacious grace* that they hate even the name of it, and that they cannot allow of its appearing in the Scriptures. Such is the reply made by Mr. Arnauld to M. Mallet. He maintains that as the Greek text has there the verb *ἐνεργεῖν*, the proper translation was *agir avec efficace*. 'We maintain,' adds the doctor, 'that such is the true signification of the Greek word, and that it means, not only *agir*, but *agir avec efficace*.'

"But without taking any side whatever in this quarrel between the two doctors, may we not reply to M. Arnauld that he professes to translate from the Latin Vulgate, and not from the Greek original. Now there is nothing in the Latin of that *efficace* which many learned persons even say they cannot discover in the Greek. Is it allowable for an author who undertakes to translate the Vulgate into French, to depart from it in the passages which, as he imagines, support his own prejudices? Should not a good interpreter, as has already been remarked, be uniform in his translation?"^b

We shall quote one more passage from Richard Simon, on the same subject:—

"The first passage in which I find the word *efficace* added without any necessity by the Mons translators is in Galatians xi. 8, where they have:

^a *Histoire Critique*, p. 422.

^b *Ibid.*, p. 454.

celui qui a agi efficacement dans Pierre. The Greek has ὁ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ, and the Vulgate, translating literally, *qui operatus est Petro.* Castalio has also translated *qui in Petro egit* I find no fault with Erasmus and Beza for translating *qui efficax fuit*, because they followed the Greek and not the Latin, and the Greek verb may have that meaning, although they had no reason to abandon the old interpreter. The Mons translators cannot give the same excuse; indeed, as they profess to follow the Vulgate, they were the more bound to adhere to it here as well as elsewhere. Besides, unless in cases of absolute necessity, it is bad taste to put two words in a translation when the original gives only one. Now, in order to prove that there was no necessity whatever to insert in the passage under consideration the word *efficace*, I shall only adduce the fifth verse of the third chapter of the same Epistle. Here the Greek gives us ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν, and the Vulgate, *qui operatur virtutes in vobis.* Mess. de Port Royal have also translated simply: *qui fait des miracles parmi vous.*"

The finishing stroke inflicted by the Oratorian is in the following passage, where he sarcastically pretends to exculpate Antoine Arnauld from the crime of wishing to upset the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church.

"In short, the word *efficace* is so much to the taste of Mess. de Port Royal, that it appears once more in their version, 2 Thess. ii. 11, where we read: *Dieu leur enverra un esprit d'erreur si efficace, qu'ils croiront un mensonge.* This expression is somewhat stronger than that of the Vulgate, *mittet illis Deus operationem erroris, ut credant mendacio.* This ancient interpreter has preserved complete uniformity in the rendering of the words ἐνεργεῖν and ἐνεργεῖα. The Mons translators remark in their note that the literal version is *une efficace d'erreur.* Beza has also translated *efficacia erroris*, and to make his thought clearer still, he adds in a note that it is *une vertu très efficace pour tromper.* Hence he concludes that the divines of the Romish persuasion are very wrong when they make so much of the prescriptive rights of their church. "*Id est,*" the Calvinist remarks, "*vim quamdam in illis decipiendis efficacissimam. Eant nunc Sophistæ, et Ecclesiæ suæ prescriptionem nobis objiciant.*" God forbid that I should ascribe the same thought to the Port Royal translators!"

If, however, Richard Simon was fond of pen-and-ink disputes, he had found his match in the great champion of Jansenism—the indefatigable Arnauld. Attacked by the Jesuits as well as by the Oratorian critic, the Port Royalists bravely stood the fire directed against them. "*Forti tamen ac constanti animo,*" says Walchius, "*versionem suam defenderunt a censuris publicis pariter ac privatis.*" Mallet, Maimbourg, Tellier, were called to account as well as Simon, and the animadversions of which the

* *Histoire Critique*, p. 455.

* *Ibid.*, pp. 459, 460.

* *Biblioth. Theolog.*, iv., pp. 154, 155.

Mons New Testament was the object, the sentence of condemnation pronounced both in Paris and in Rome, were ascribed to the influence of the *Cabale Jésuitique*. Bayle, writing to one of his friends, says: "M. Arnauld a assez bien étrillé le P. Simon dans la 6^e et 7^e partie de ses difficultés à M. Steyaert;"* we believe, however, that the combatants were very well matched, and that neither of them could claim the advantage.†

About the same time there was some idea of publishing in Paris a new and revised edition of Richard Simon's work. M. de Harlay, who protected the Oratorian, took a great interest in this scheme, and even Bossuet was not averse to it, for he believed that the extensive learning of the author might be, if judiciously applied, rendered useful to the Church; and he still entertained the hope of obtaining from him some partial retraction of his critical errors. It was with this idea that he conceived the plan of proposing to him, together with a suitable remuneration, the undertaking of a serious work, which required a deep knowledge of the Oriental languages, and also of the particular tenets of the Eastern Churches. A large number of productions, composed by the Schismatic Greeks, had till then remained unanswered, because no one capable of doing so could overcome the preliminary difficulty of mastering the idiom in which these treatises were written. At the suggestion of the celebrated Renaudot, Bossuet thought of entrusting the task to Simon; but the condition was the giving up the ideas maintained by the Oratorian on the subject of the authorship of the Pentateuch, and to this he would not consent. Finally, irritated at seeing himself attacked on all sides, Richard Simon once again determined upon giving free scope to his critical propensities, and speaking still more distinctly than he had done before. The *Histoire Critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament* was the result of this state of mind: it appeared at Rotterdam, in 1693.‡ The great object of the work is to attack the views of the Augustinian school of divines on Predestination and Free Grace, and with this design before him he invokes here again the grand principle of tradition. The origin of the commentaries and explanations of Scripture composed by the Fathers of the Church must, he maintains, be chiefly traced to the necessity of opposing the views of the Gnostics, who, by distributing under three classes all the family of man, struck a fatal blow at the freedom of the will, and at our position in this world as moral and responsible

* *Lettre à M. Silvestre*, p. 463 of the folio edition, vol. 4.

† On the discussions between Arnauld and Richard Simon, see also M. Sainte-Beuve's *Port-Royal*.

‡ 1 vol. 4to, Reinier Leers.

creatures. For, according to their teaching, all the spiritually-minded are necessarily and inevitably saved, whilst all the carnally-minded are to the same extent necessarily and inevitably lost. "The first Fathers," our author continues, "who were obliged to attack these vain dreams, have forgotten nothing to establish free-will, shewing that our salvation absolutely depends upon ourselves. It is with reference to the false notions of the Gnostics that they differed from St. Augustine whilst talking about divine grace, the freedom of the will, predestination and reprobation. The Bishop of Hippo, having opposed the innovations of Pelagius, who, on the contrary, ascribed everything to man's free-will, and left nothing to divine grace, was the originator of a new system. He distinguished himself from the old commentators, having invented explanations which had never been heard of previously. We cannot, therefore, condemn as Pelagian, or semi-Pelagian, the interpretations of the early fathers, unless we reject the whole traditions of the Church."^a Then, quoting the authority of Vincentius Lirinensis as a proof that the theological views of Saint Augustine should not be accepted unless *cum grano salis*, he adds: "We must therefore prefer the common consent of the ancient Fathers to Saint Augustine's private opinions. The first four centuries of the Church had only one and the same language to describe free-will, predestination and grace. It is not likely that all the early Fathers were mistaken on subjects of that importance, nor can any one accuse them reasonably of having consulted the principles of their philosophy rather than the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists. I have not pretended for this reason to condemn the recent interpretations given to Saint Augustine, interpretations which meet with much approbation. I only wish that those who glory in being his disciples, would not give out all the opinions of their master as so many articles of faith. In order to be orthodox, it is enough to acknowledge a true, internal, and preventing grace. The fathers being all of one mind on this point, no one can be accused of Palagianism or semi-Pelagianism for not agreeing with Saint Augustine about every point of doctrine."^b

It was something quite new to see an Oratorian talking with such freedom of the Fathers of the Church; but the comparative praise which Richard Simon awards to Grotius, and to other Arminian Protestants,^c excited the utmost scandal, and indisposed against him the Jansenists and the Calvinists, as well as the Gallicans. No epithet was bad enough to apply to him. "C'est

^a Preface, p. 50.

^b *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 3.

^c See chap. 54.

dans le fond un impie," says Bayle; and such was really the opinion of the majority. "In hac quoque *historid criticd*," Walchius remarks, "Simon animum perversum ostendit ac temerarium audacemque criticum se præbet. Ac quamvis in ista non tot exempla pravarum sententiarum sint, quot in *Historid criticd veteris Testamenti* habentur; rei tamen hujus causa non alia est, nisi angustius argumentum, ab eo explanandum."^d

The principles adopted by Richard Simon, in criticising the text of Scriptures, and the explanations of commentators, guided him in his French translation of the New Testament, which was published first at Trévoux in 1702, and the next year at Rouen. It was dedicated to the Duke du Maine, sovereign of the principality of Dombes. The duke himself had granted his privilege, and Doctor Bouvet, a professor of Sorbonne, had given his approbation.^e Bossuet, however, always on the alert, contrived to stop the sale of the work until it had been thoroughly examined. If we may believe Walchius, this new version was far from deserving the severe strictures passed upon it both by the Bishop of Meaux, and also by the Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris. "Singulis libris," he says, "evangelistarum atque apostolorum præmissæ sunt præfationes eruditissimæ ac notæ subjectæ dignæ quæ a critices sacræ studiosis perlegantur."^f Richard Simon answered his censors with a spirit and in a tone which manifestly shewed that he was backed by influential protectors. Chancellor Pontchartrain and the Abbé Bignon, who held the important post of *Directeur général de la librairie*, were, indeed, exerting on his behalf all their credit, annoyed as they were by the overbearing character of Bossuet and the prejudices of the cardinal. Pontchartrain felt irritated that a work to which he had given his approbation should be stopped. Bignon accused the cardinal of having prevented him from being raised to the episcopate, and was anxious to exercise a little revenge upon him for that motive. Saint Simon gives as follows the details of the whole transaction:—

"It was some time since a dispute had been brewing between the chancellor and the bishops, when a fresh quarrel with the Bishop de Chartres brought matters to a crisis about the end of this year (1702). The prelates enjoyed the right of publishing, on their own authority, their customary pastoral letters, prayer-books, and a few short catechisms for the use of children. They wished to take advantage of the king's zeal against

^d *Biblioth. Theol.*, iv., 258.

^e *Le Nouveau Testament de notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, traduit sur l'ancienne édition Latine, avec des remarques littérales et critiques sur les principales difficultés*, 4 vols. 8vo.

^f *Biblioth. Theologic.*, iv., 156.

Jansenism and Quietism, in order to assume gradually the right of issuing more important doctrinal works without either permission or privilege. The chancellor did not approve of such pretensions, and thereupon a few discussions arose; the bishops asserting that as they were judges in matters of faith, no person had a right to control their doctrinal treatises, and that, accordingly, they needed no permission to get them printed; the chancellor, on the other hand, maintained the right he had always exerted; without claiming to decide anything respecting points of doctrine, he wanted to prevent discussions from increasing so far as to disturb the State. Private sentiments, he said, should not be allowed to spread a leaven of bitterness; the domination formerly usurped by the bishops, and now reduced within proper limits, might perhaps reappear; and, finally, care should be taken lest any doctrines contrary to the maxims of the Gallican Church were surreptitiously introduced into works designed for publication.

"This ferment lasted until the Bishops of Meaux and of Chartres came to take a personal part in them by their writings, which were ready to be printed against M. Simon, a restless *savant*, author of a great number of theological works, amongst others of a translation of the New Testament, with literal and critical remarks, which the Cardinal de Noailles and the Bishop of Meaux condemned in their pastoral instructions. He retorted by his remonstrances; M. de Meaux and M. de Chartres wrote against him; and the storm, which had been for a long time brewing, burst out on the occasion of the two prelates wishing to print and circulate their critiques without asking for either the inspection or the authority of the chancellor."⁷

Saint Simon then shews us Madame de Maintenon interfering on behalf of the prelates against Pontchartrain, to whom she owed a personal grudge, whilst Louis XIV., urged on by the Jesuits, and afraid of displeasing the widow Scarron, could not, at the same time, make up his mind to set aside altogether the chancellor's remonstrances. He hoped that the quarrel might terminate by concessions from both parties, and that, indeed, was what took place. As far as Simon's works were concerned, "Some alterations were required and made on points which the chancellor himself did not approve of."⁸

Bossuet's secretary, the Abbé Leduc, whose curious and amusing journal has been published some years ago,¹ also gives the whole details of this crusade against Richard Simon, and we can trace almost day by day, from the entries made by the Boswell of the Bishop of Meaux, the progress of this complicated affair. We shall give a few characteristic extracts:—

"Wednesday, May 24th, 1702.—M. de Meaux has said mass in his

⁷ Saint Simon, *Mémoires*; édit. Hachette; iv., pp. 64, 65. ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

¹ *Mémoires et Journal sur la vie et les ouvrages de Bossuet*, 4 vols. 8vo, Paris, Didier.

chapel at Germigny. He has received information that his remarks on M. Simon have reached their destination, and that they have produced much effect. He is more and more determined upon following them up, and upon getting the translation entirely suppressed, saying that this business is more important to the Church than all those to which he has previously devoted himself."^j

"*Monday, 29th.*—M. de Meaux does nothing but speak about M. Simon; what an artful writer he is, how pernicious are his works. It is impossible to allow them to circulate, and if the publication of the New Testament were permitted, even after all the corrections made to it, it would be as much as sanctioning the author's previous treatises; we must take advantage of this occasion to compel the man to an explanation about his works, in order that he may re-establish his character. It must not be said that the Church receives a version made by a writer who has taught so many errors, so much the more because the errors contained in his other books are the same as those which are now corrected in his version. . . . M. de Meaux seems very anxious, and says distinctly that this business is more important for the Church than the one of M. de Cambrai,^k because the question just now is about a book destined for the common people."^l

"*Monday, August 28th.*— . . . Here is the bishop's intention. He means, first, to attack briefly the preface of the New Testament, by shewing that the author is a downright Socinian, who explains and translates every passage in the New Testament only according to the sense, and in following the interpretations of the Socinians, Episcopius, Crellius, and the others."^m

Almost every page in the journal contains entries referring to Richard Simon, and to his obnoxious version of the New Testament. Ponchartrain, however, stands in the way, and Bossuet, impatient of all restraint, does not conceal his irritation.

"*Sunday, January 14th, 1703.*— . . . There is still wanting, nevertheless, the interference of the secular authority against the book of Richard Simon. I was speaking yesterday to the prelate about it, relating to him what I had heard, namely, that people were talking of a decree of the council, suppressing the privilege and the version itself. 'I know nothing about it,' said M. de Meaux to me, 'but it is astonishing that whilst so much is said against the book, *M. le Chancelier* does nothing. Does he want to be reminded of his duty, and to be compelled by superior authority? We shall have to come to that, unless he acts of his own accord.' He has made me understand that both the Cardinal de Noailles and himself are determined upon asking the King for an order suppressing the work, after they have allowed the chancellor sufficient time to do so spontaneously."ⁿ

Richard Simon could, of course, do nothing against so determined a man as Bossuet, and he was reduced to defend his

^j Vol. ii., Journal 1, p. 289.

^k Fénelon. Lediou alludes here to the famous disputes about Quietism.

^l *Ibid.*, p. 290.

^m *Ibid.*, p. 303.

ⁿ *Ibid.*, p. 370.

opinions in a number of pamphlets and explanatory letters, which were afterwards collected together.* He published, besides, a new edition of a well-known work on the re-union of the Protestants to the Roman Catholic Church, which had been composed by Camus, bishop of Belley. His object in doing so was to vent his spite against Bossuet, whom he accused of having impudently given a mere transcript of the older prelate's controversial treatise, when he issued his well-known *Exposition de la foi de l'Eglise Catholique*.

The pugnacious Oratorian finally retired to Dieppe, where he died April 11th, 1712, "dans des dispositions très édifiantes." We shall not transcribe here the long catalogue of his works, which the readers can find in Walchius, Nicéron, and the *Biographie Universelle*. His life has been written by Bruzen de la Martinière, his nephew, and appears in the first volume of the *Lettres Choiesies*, quoted above; but it cannot altogether be trusted. As a general summary of his character, we may be allowed to say that, deserving as he does the greatest praise for his learning, his patience, and his industry, he unfortunately employed these gifts in destroying as far as he could the faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures. His theory about tradition was no doubt maintained by him with the utmost sincerity, but its effect was certainly to shake to its very foundations the authority of the Bible. It is absurd to represent him exclusively as a martyr to religious persecution, and to accuse Bossuet of being animated against him by feelings of private pique. Not only the orthodox Gallicans, but even Arminians, like Leclerc, saw perfectly well the dangerous consequences which might be deduced from his books, and Bayle himself—surely no dogmatist—called him an "impious man." He had a mania of concealing his name under all sorts of shapes, but it was very easy to recognise him, both by the boldness of his assertions, and the erudition displayed in his works; and Saint Jore, le Prieur de Bolleville, and Dom Récarède Siméon, were immediately identified with the author of the *Histoire Critique du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament*. Bruzen de la Martinière says that Richard Simon destroyed all his MSS. for fear lest the chief magistrate of Rouen should seize them and give them over to the Jesuits; but it is evidently a mistake, for the whole of the Oratorian's library exists now amongst the treasures of the Rouen cathedral, at least if we may believe Tabaraud's article in the *Biographie Universelle*.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

* *Lettres Choiesies*, 1730, 4 vols. 12mo, and *Bibliothèque Choiesie, par le Sieur de Saint-Jore*. 4 vols. 12mo, 1708—10.

**THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF THE GOSPELS TESTED BY
AN EXAMINATION OF THEIR CONTENTS.**

BY THE REV. C. A. ROW.

(Continued from No. XVII., page 91.)

WE will now consider the fourfold narrative of the resurrection. It is evident that if the Gospels are mythic, or if miracles are impossible, although the story of the resurrection may be a great ideal conception, instead of being an historic fact, it must be a fable. In whatever way we may suppose it to have originated, whether as a misconception, or as the crowning poetic conception of the life of Jesus, or as the realization of a deep instinct in human nature, objective reality it had none. The primitive belief in it, and the account of that belief embodied in the Gospels, must be a creation of the human mind, and nothing else; a great creation, doubtless, but one devoid of objective truth.

But whatever supposition we may adopt as to the nature of the account of the resurrection, as we read it in our present Gospels, it is impossible not to be deeply struck by the phenomena which these Gospels present. They are entirely devoid of any attempt to present us with a picture of the mode in which the event itself actually occurred. According to their testimony, no human eye witnessed the issuing of the Saviour's body from the tomb. We, accordingly, find neither of these four writers attempting to give us the smallest description of the mode in which the miracle of the resurrection was effected. Of other miracles of our Lord, Mark and John have given us graphic descriptions. These must be either descriptions taken from the life, or mythical inventions. But with respect to that very miracle of which we might expect a description, coloured by the richest powers of the imagination, if the account be mythic, we have not even the smallest attempt to portray the manner in which the crucified one issued from the grave, and assumed his body of immortality. The narratives of the crucifixion and of the resurrection present us with the most striking contrast. The former contains a minute and detailed account of the event itself, the latter leaves it wholly undescribed. Is this contrast in accordance with the historical conditions of the case? The first event was witnessed by multitudes. The Gospels accordingly abound with graphic details. The resur-

rection was unseen by human eye. The event itself is undescribed, and the account of the collateral circumstances is distinguished by an absence of precision more than any narrative in the Gospels.

But if myth or poetic conception generated the story, the scene is one on which poetic invention could have lavished its richest stores. The resurrection of Jesus, as a conception, is the grandest of the creations of the Gospels. It is the culmination of the idea on which the evangelical narrative is based. No subject could have been more tempting for a poet than the delineation of the contrast between the humiliation of the crucifixion and the glory of the resurrection. A few touches of Mark's pictorial pencil would have accomplished this. But the graphic painter of the miracles of Christ's earthly ministry has no description to give us of the great miracle which was its consummation. Now if the Gospels are myths, the absence of all attempts to describe the resurrection must have been owing to want of genius adequately to paint a resurrection. Yet St. John has not shrunk from the attempt to describe such a miracle; he has portrayed the Saviour summoning Lazarus from the tomb.

Now whatever theory may be assumed respecting this miracle, even those who assert that it is a pure invention must concede that the person who composed the narrative as we read it in the fourth Gospel was a great artist. If the writer thought it necessary, for the purposes of his fiction, to invent a miracle of a resurrection, he has shewn no lack of genius. Given the idea of Jesus as the God man, and supposing it to have been necessary to portray him as summoning a corpse from the grave, no person can deny that the account of the resurrection of Lazarus in the fourth Gospel is described with uncommon power.

We will assume that the narrative of the resurrection of Lazarus is a myth; let us observe the propriety with which the entire conception has been *elaborated*. There was a family to which our Lord was united in the closest bonds of human friendship, consisting of a brother and two sisters. The brother falls ill; Jesus is at a distance. The sisters send to him the message, "Lord, behold he whom thou lovest is sick." Our Lord, firm in the determination to await the purposes of his Father, and knowing that his Providence will accomplish his glorification, still continues two days in the place where he was. He tells the disciples that "the sickness was not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." After two days Jesus sets out on his journey, notwithstanding warnings of danger given him by the disciples. He is secure under the

providence of his Father. "Are there not twelve hours in the day. If a man walk in the day he stumbleth not, because he sees the light of this world; but if a man walk in the night he stumbleth, because there is no light in him." "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth," says Jesus, "and I go, that I may awake him out of sleep." "If he sleep," say the disciples, "he shall do well." "Lazarus is dead," is the reply. Jesus arrives in Bethany: Lazarus had died four days previously. The sisters are surrounded with sympathizing friends. Martha meets Jesus outside the village; she falls at his feet, saying, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. But I know that even now, whatever thou shalt ask of God, God will give it thee." Jesus—"Thy brother shall rise again." Martha—"I know that he shall rise again at the resurrection at the last day. Jesus—"I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?" Martha—"Yes, I believe that thou art the Christ—the Son of God." Martha calls Mary. As soon as she sees Jesus she falls down at his feet, and exclaims, "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." Mary and the Jews weep. Jesus checks himself, and inquires where they had laid him. He then gives way to his sympathy, and weeps. Some of the bystanders recognize this as a proof of his affection; others inquire whether the man who had opened the eyes of one who had been born blind could not have hindered the death of Lazarus. Jesus again checks his feelings. They come to the grave; it was a cave, and a stone lay on it. Jesus says to the bystanders, "Take ye away the stone." Martha—"He is putrid, for he has been dead four days." Jesus—"Did I not tell thee that if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God?" The stone is removed. Jesus invokes the Father: "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me, and I know that thou hearest me always; but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." Jesus then calls with a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth." He who had been dead issues from the grave, bound hand and foot with grave clothes, and his face wrapt in a napkin. Jesus says, "Loose him, and let him go."

It has often been urged as an objection against the truth of this miracle that it is recorded by St. John alone. We shall not inquire why all mention of it has been passed over by the synoptics; we will allow the objector to assert that it is a fiction. In that case the fiction has been conceived and developed with the most complete propriety. The best mode of

forming an adequate conception of the felicity with which the Evangelist has developed this story, would be for the objector to attempt to solve the problem of inventing a story of a resurrection by giving the description of one with equal brevity and effect, assuming the characters in the scene, or inventing others equally perfect. Let him compare the result with St. John's resurrection of Lazarus.

It is evident, therefore, whether the resurrection of Lazarus be an historical event or a fiction, the author of John's Gospel has not omitted to give us a graphic description of the resurrection of Jesus, owing to deficiency of power to produce such a description. If we assume that the resurrection of Lazarus was a fact, then the author of the Gospel has copied from the life; but if it is a fiction, then the powers of the inventor were such as to enable him to invent a description of it worthy of the subject and the characters engaged. If, therefore, it was necessary to invent a myth of the resurrection of Jesus, the Evangelist has not failed to give a description of such a resurrection, because he had not the powers to invent the suitable circumstances with which it ought to have been attended. He who could have invented such a fiction as the resurrection of Lazarus would have found no great difficulty in clothing the mythic belief in the resurrection of Jesus in suitable circumstances. But if both miracles were historical events, the reason is obvious why we have a description of the one and not of the other. The one was witnessed by the Evangelist, the other was not.

We will now examine the narrative of the resurrection itself.

The mode in which the notes of time are given by the Evangelists is worthy of attention. Matthew writes that "*ὅψ' ἐδὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the sepulchre, and, behold, there was (*ἐγένετο*) a great earthquake, for an angel of the Lord having descended from heaven, having approached, rolled away the stone and sat upon it."

Mark says, "When the Sabbath was passed (*Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου*), Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome bought spices, in order that they might come and anoint him; and very early on the first day of the week (*Καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων*) they came to the sepulchre, the sun having arisen (*ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*), and they said among themselves, Who shall roll for us the stone from the door of the sepulchre? And looking up, they saw that the stone had been rolled away; for it was very great. And going to the

sepulchre they see a young man sitting on the right, and they were afraid."

Luke—"On the first day of the week, at deep dawn (*Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἄρθρου βαθείας*) they came (i. e., the women who had accompanied our Lord from Galilee), bringing the spices which they had prepared (these spices had been bought on Friday night), and they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And entering in, they did not find the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, while they were perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments."

John—"On the first day of the week (*Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων*), Mary Magdalene came early while it was still dark (*πρωτὶ σκοτίας ἔτι οὕσης*) to the sepulchre, and sees the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. She runs to tell Peter and John, etc. But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping, and as she wept, she looked into the sepulchre, and sees two angels in white sitting," etc.

Now, what were the ideas which the authors of the Gospels intended to convey to their readers when they wrote these passages? and on whose testimony do the facts themselves rest? The latter question is easily answered. The account in John professes to be in part autoptic, and for the remainder Mary Magdalene is the authority. The other narratives must rest on the testimony of one or more women, either directly given, or after it had passed through one or more transmissions, unless we except a small portion, which may possibly be the autoptic testimony of Peter.

In considering this question it is of the highest importance that we should maintain clearly the distinction between what was known and intended to be reported by the author of each separate Gospel, and what may be the history of the resurrection which can be composed by a careful comparison of these four narratives. This obvious distinction students are much in the habit of overlooking. They are constantly in the habit of mentally interpolating in one Gospel what they only know by means of another. A general account of the resurrection is the work of the person who compiles it. Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John are responsible only for what they have written, and for no more.

Who, then, are the women who are described by the different Evangelists as taking part in the events of the resurrection morning? Matthew mentions two only, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary. But in describing the final scene at the cross late on Friday afternoon, he tells us that many women were

beholding at a distance, among whom he mentions the two Marias and the mother of Zebedee's children. After describing the funeral, without telling us that the other women had retired, or at all accounting for their absence, he mentions only the two Marias as witnessing it. These, again, are the only two women whom he describes as visiting the tomb on Sunday morning.

Mark describes three women as visiting the sepulchre, the two Marias, and Salome. According to him, these three women had bought spices on Saturday night for the purpose of anointing the body. These three women also in company with others, beheld the last scene on the cross. He agrees with Matthew in representing the two Marias alone as witnesses of the burial. The general impression produced by his narrative is, that on Sunday morning other women accompanied the three.

Luke's narrative is peculiar. No persons are named till the end of it. He then tells us that Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and other women, reported *these things* unto the Apostles. He had previously told us, that all his acquaintance and the women which came from Galilee witnessed the last scene on Friday afternoon. He then says that the women who came from Galilee followed the body to the sepulchre. We cannot view this last statement as other than a general one, for it is hardly possible to believe, after the statements of Matthew and Mark, that any other of the women actually witnessed the burial except the two Marias, for while Mark had mentioned Salome and others as present a few lines before, he distinctly mentions the two Marias only as witnessing the interment. He seems purposely to have omitted the name of Salome, Joanna, or any other. Luke then represents the women as returning and buying spices on the Friday night, and resting on the Sabbath. We must not forget to remember that Mark asserts that the spices were purchased on the Saturday night. This same body of women are then described by Luke as starting for the sepulchre on Sunday morning, carrying the spices with them. He adds that they were accompanied by others. Who can he mean by the others? The persons previously mentioned were the women who accompanied our Lord from Galilee. But these words are omitted by several of the best manuscripts, and are probably spurious. The whole form of the narrative implies some doubt in the author's mind, which were the women actually present at the events described in it. Taking his expressions generally, we may conclude that he viewed the number of women not mentioned by him as larger than that of those whom he actually names. He has selected the

chief for mention as Mark seems to have done, the one assigning the place of honour to Salome and the other to Joanna.

John's account mentions one woman only, Mary Magdalene, the person who ran to bring him and Peter word on Sunday morning, and from whom he evidently had his information.

We have now to consider the notes of time. John's account professes to be directly autoptic. It has nothing merely general about it. We will examine it first.

He tells us that Mary Magdalene came to the sepulchre, *τῇ μὲν τῶν σαββάτων πρώτ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης*, a date of the utmost distinctness; "early while it was yet dark." Such an expression can only denote the darkness which precedes sunrise, and not the darkness which is the consequence of a cloudy morning. As John himself came to the sepulchre shortly after on Mary's summons, he could not have failed to know whether the visit was made before or after sunrise. The expression which he uses, "Early while it was yet dark," can only denote a time of the day before sunrise.

Luke gives a precisely similar date for the visit of the women mentioned by him, *δρθρον θαθέος*, which means deep dawn. It cannot possibly be said to be deep dawn either at or after sunrise. Luke gives this as the time when the women mentioned by him came to the sepulchre, bringing the spices.

With these two dates Matthew seems in agreement, *ὁψὲ σαββάτων τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*. This expression is apparently intended to denote the dawning of Sunday morning. The words themselves might possibly mean Saturday night after the Jewish Sabbath was ended. But the Jewish mode of reckoning the commencement of the day was of a most artificial character, and the fair conclusion is, that the Evangelist intended to denote the commencement of the natural, and not of the Jewish day. If so, the time is the same as that given by Luke and John.

But Mark's date is very peculiar. He tells us that after the Sabbath was past, *i.e.*, some time after sunset on Saturday night, the women purchased spices, and *λίαν πρώτ τῆς μῆς σαββάτων*, which must mean "very early on the first day of the week, they came to the sepulchre," *ἀνατείλαντος*, or, as some read it, *ἀνατέλλοντος τοῦ ἡλίου*, which must mean either after or at sunrise, certainly not before it, neither the deep dawn of Luke, nor while it was yet dark of John. But the date itself presents us with an inconsistency. Either at or after sunrise at this season of the year cannot be said to be very early in the morning, when the sunrise must have taken place between five and six. The

habits of the Jews were early. Their business was conducted early. Therefore any period at or after sunrise could not be described as "very early."

Mark describes the time when the Jews held their council previously to conducting our Lord to Pilate as being *ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτ* early, not *λίαν πρῶτ*, very early. The whole narrative implies that this council was held at break of day. Luke expressly states the time it was held to have been *ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα*, when it was day. Matthew, *Πρῶτας γενομένης*, when the morning was come. *Λίαν πρῶτ*, therefore, must denote a time before sunrise. This portion of the date quite agrees with that of the other Evangelists. What then are we to do with the expression, *ἀνατείλωντος*, or *ἀνατέλλοντος τοῦ ἡλίου*, at or after sunrise? It can only be accounted for on the supposition that the date given by Mark has originated in his uniting together the accounts of different women who must have visited the sepulchre at different times, the one very early while it was yet dark, and the other either at or after the rising of the sun.

It is true that no such separate visits are asserted by any one of the Evangelists, but the accounts set forth distinct purposes in the women in visiting the tomb, many women as making the visit, and different events as following the visit. The date, therefore, as given by Mark, though inconsistent in itself, is easily accounted for, if one body of women reported that they had visited the tomb before, and the other after or at sunrise.

Matthew represents that the visit of Mary Magdalene and the other Mary was for the purpose of seeing the sepulchre. John's account of the visit of Mary Magdalene implies that such was her purpose. The idea that she was carrying spices to embalm the body is hardly consistent with his narrative.

But the account in Mark and Luke is express, that the women mentioned by them were bringing spices for the purpose of anointing the body, and among the names is that of Mary Magdalene. But both these accounts represent that the women were in considerable numbers, and that they did not merely consist of the women actually named by them. But if she went with one or more companions for the purpose of seeing how matters were about the sepulchre before the arrival of the embalmers, it was very likely that her name would get into the general account of Mark and Luke; and if two parties of women went at an interval of an hour, the confusion of date which we observe in the Evangelists would have originated by the time of the visit of the earlier group being applied to that of the later, and *vice versâ*; or by both being united together in a date which is inconsistent with itself. Phenomena of this kind will be always

found connected with scenes in which the agents are under the influence of excitement. The presence of discrepancies in the dates of such events is so far from being inconsistent with historical reality, that it is one of the most striking evidences of it. If such events readily dovetailed into each other, the writer might fairly be suspected of a desire to make everything smooth and pleasant. The phenomena presented by the passages in question, the incongruities, and the account which can be given of them, are such as are never found in mythic narratives.

A similar character pervades the narratives of the Evangelists as to what the women actually saw at the sepulchre. St. John's account is clear and distinct. Mary Magdalene observes that the stone was removed from the door of the sepulchre. She at once rushes off to tell Peter and John. They immediately run to the sepulchre. John outruns Peter. He stoops down, sees the linen clothes lying, but does not enter. Peter follows and enters at once, observes the linen clothes and the napkin wrapt up separately. Hereupon John enters, sees, and believes. Both disciples then return home. But Mary, who by this time has returned to the sepulchre, remains outside it weeping. She stoops down, looks into the sepulchre, and sees two angels sitting, one at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. They ask her the cause of her tears. She tells them that it was the removal of the Lord's body. As soon as she had said this, she turns about and sees a person standing by her. He asks her the same question as the angels. She supposes him to be the gardener, and requests him to tell her where he had deposited the body, and she would remove it. Jesus addresses her by name. She recognizes him, and exclaims, Rabboni. Jesus tells her not to touch him, and dismisses her with a message to the Apostles. She goes and tells them that she had seen the Lord. The whole of this account is marked by definiteness and precision. John and Mary have told what they actually saw and no more.

But very different in character are the synoptic narratives. Matthew tells us that the two Maries came to see the sepulchre. There was (*ἐγένετο*) a great earthquake. For an angel of the Lord having descended (*καταβὰς*) from heaven, having approached, (*προσελθὼν*) rolled away (*ἀπεκύλισεν*) the stone, and sat on it; his appearance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. And for fear of him the keepers shook (*ἐσείσθησαν*) and became as dead men. But the angel answering said to the women, Do not you fear (*μὴ φοβείσθε ὑμεῖς*). I know that you seek Jesus, who was crucified. He is not here, he has risen, as

he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And going quickly, tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead, and behold, he goes before you into Galilee. There ye shall see him. Behold, I have told you. And having gone out quickly from the sepulchre, with fear and great joy, they ran to bring his disciples word. And behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail; and they, going up to him, took him by the feet, and worshipped him. Then Jesus says to them, Do not fear, go tell my brethren, that they go into Galilee, and there they shall see me."

Mark tells us that on Friday evening the two Maries and Salome bought spices for the purposes of embalming the body, and very early in the morning, at sunrise, they came to the sepulchre: they say among themselves, "Who shall roll for us the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" And looking up, they see that the stone had been rolled away, for it was very great.* And going to the sepulchre they saw a young man clothed in a white robe, sitting on the right side, and they were afraid. But he says to them, Do not be filled with amazement. Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified. He has risen. He is not here. Behold the place where they laid him. But go say to his disciples and Peter, that he goes before you into Galilee. There ye shall see him, as he said to you. And going out they fled from the sepulchre, for trembling and astonishment seized them, and they said nothing to any, for they were afraid." The concluding portion of the Gospel, whether written by Mark or added by another hand, tells us that "Jesus, having risen early on the first day of the week, appeared first of all to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast seven devils. And she going, told it to those who had been with him, who were mourning and weeping; and they hearing that he was risen, and had been seen by her, *disbelieved it.*"

Luke represents the women of whom he had made previous mention, as buying spices on Friday night, and resting on the Sabbath. Very early in the morning they came to the tomb carrying the spices. But they found that the stone had been rolled away from the tomb; and having entered it, they did not find the body. And it came to pass, while they were in doubt about it, behold, two men stood by them in shining clothes. But when they were terrified, and bent their faces to the earth, they said to them, Why seek you him who is alive among the dead?

* It is worthy of remark, that while Matthew has not used a single pluperfect tense in his narrative, Mark, by the use of the pluperfect, distinctly defines the rolling back of the stone as having taken place previously to the arrival of the women mentioned by him. Mary Magdalene, also, at her visit while it was yet dark, found the stone already rolled back.

He is not here, but is risen. Remember how he spake unto you, being yet in Galilee, saying, that the Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of wicked men, and be crucified, and on the third day rise again. And they remembered his words; and departing from the sepulchre, they told these things to the eleven, and to all the rest (and they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the rest with them, who told these things to the Apostles). And their words appeared to them as idle tales, and they disbelieved them. But Peter rising up, ran to the sepulchre, and stooping down, he saw the linen clothes lying alone, and went home (*ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν*) wondering at what had happened."

According to the natural meaning of John's narrative, Mary Magdalene ran to inform Peter and John of the removal of the stone before she had seen any angel inside or outside. The fact that the tomb was open leads her at once to the suspicion that the body had been removed. It is certain that she could have conversed with no angel previously to her departure. On her return she looks into the sepulchre, and sees two angels inside it. Their recorded words addressed to her entirely differ from those reported by the synoptics as having been spoken to the other women. "Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou?" Her reply shews that she had not yet received any assurance of a resurrection: "because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." Saying these things she turned backwards (*ταῦτα εἰποῦσα ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*), which, taken in their natural sense, imply that before the angels had said anything else to her beyond asking her why she was weeping, and whom she was seeking, she turned round and saw Jesus. The words which she addresses to him under the mistake that he was the gardener, "If thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away," are quite inconsistent with the idea that she had just been assured by the angels in the tomb that he was risen from the dead. Our Lord's words to her, "Touch me not," imply either an intention to embrace him, or that she had already done so. After this, John tells us that she conveyed a message to the Apostles. These facts have every appearance of circumstantiality. This appearance of our Lord is evidently the one alluded to by Mark, in the continuation of his Gospel, when he tells us that our Lord appeared first to Mary Magdalene.

Luke's account is next in circumstantiality, but evidently of a very different character from that of John. As it ought to do, it bears the marks not of direct autoptic testimony, but of compilation. The parenthetical manner in which the names of

the women are introduced, in which it is not asserted that they all witnessed the events narrated by the Evangelist, but that they were the persons who brought reports to the Apostles, implies a hesitancy in the author's mind whether they had each beheld the events of the preceding narrative. What Luke evidently intended to assert was, that the spectators of what he narrates were Galilean women, and that while the two Marias and Joanna did report what they had seen to the Apostles, yet he does not pledge himself that each of the three was a witness of what he describes. The women whom Luke describes as visiting the sepulchre were carrying spices, which they had bought on Friday night. From John's account (and this must contain her own testimony) Mary Magdalene was not carrying spices on her visit to the tomb. According to Matthew and John, she went to take a view of the sepulchre. She must, therefore, have gone before the others. Luke describes those mentioned by him, as soon as they observed that the stone was gone, as at once entering into the sepulchre, and ascertaining by inspection that the body was not there. They see no angel on the outside, and had Luke's authority informed him that there was, it is difficult to suppose that he would have suppressed it designedly. Before any one appears to the women, they have time to feel great perplexity at the condition of the tomb. It is evident that this is a description of a state of things different from that seen by Mary Magdalene. Luke's narrative, also, agrees with that of John, in stating that two angels appeared inside the sepulchre, but the words used by them entirely differ from those addressed to Mary Magdalene, as reported by John. Luke does not say that the women reported "the resurrection," but "these things" to the Apostles. His authority was apparently not aware that any of them had seen our Lord. Their reports are received with general unbelief; but Peter goes to the sepulchre. The identity of the words prove this to be an imperfect account of the more complete one in John, and as such, it is a remarkable confirmation of its historical veracity, for it has all the indications of having been derived from a different source. In both instances some one is described bending over and seeing the linen clothes lying (*παφαινύσας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα*). Luke adds (*μόνα*), alone. This is a substitute for John's more definite statement, that the napkin was not with the linen clothes, but wrapt up separately. Otherwise, the words are the same. But both Evangelists use the same remarkable expression to denote their going home. John writes (*ἀπῆλθον πάλιν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς*), "they returned again to themselves." Luke has (*ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν*), "he returned to himself." Harmonisers have invented

two journeys of Peter to the sepulchre. But such a singular identity of expression proves that the two Evangelists intended to record the same historical fact. Luke's narrative omits all mention of John, or that Peter entered boldly into the sepulchre. It is evident from John's account that Peter entered the sepulchre at once without bending over to look in first. This was done by John, but Luke's informant has ascribed this act to Peter. Luke, also, could hardly have been aware that the napkin was wrapt up separately, for if he had, so careful a writer would not have omitted all notice of it. John implies, that Peter did not believe that the Lord was risen in consequence of what he saw at the sepulchre. Luke, in strict conformity with this, represents Peter as wondering in himself at what had taken place. The two accounts, therefore, mutually confirm the historical reality of each other. While their agreements and disagreements point to an historical basis, they are utterly inconsistent with the theory of a mythic origin.

According to the account in Mark, the two Maries witnessed the funeral. They and Salome bought spices on Saturday night, intending to go and anoint the body. They go to the sepulchre very early in the morning, either at or after sunrise. As they are going, they discuss how the stone was to be rolled back. They look up, and see that it had been rolled away. Mark's account, like Luke's, pre-supposes that they entered the sepulchre at once. They saw there a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in white garments. They are affrighted. The angel addresses them in words almost coincident with those given by Matthew, but different from those given by Luke. The only connection between them is the assertion of the resurrection, and an allusion to Galilee, but in a wholly different connection. They are directed by the angel to convey a message to the Apostles. Then occur the following remarkable words, "And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre, for they trembled and were amazed; neither said they anything to any man, for they were afraid." At this point, if the remainder of the narrative is by another hand, as there is no little reason to think, that of Mark abruptly terminates. No appearance of our Lord to the women is mentioned by Mark, but the following words, by whomsoever written, state expressly, that Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene.

This narrative contains the following points, worthy of notice. Mark differs from Luke as to the time when the spices were bought. They can only be brought into unison by supposing that the spices were purchased at different times, but if such were the case, as it is unnoticed by either of them, it

proves that they had distinct sources of information. The two Mariés are mentioned by both; Mark adds Salomé and Luke Joanna, but both narratives imply the presence of others. Although nowhere asserted, Mark's account presents us with a trace of two visits of women to the sepulchre in its peculiar date of "very early," "at or after sunrise," an expression which, without such a supposition, appears not only inexplicable in itself, but at variance with the autoptic testimony of John, the assertion of Luke, and to the declaration of Mark that Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene, for if he appeared first to her, it is self-evident that she must have visited the sepulchre apart from the others, and not in company with any one. Such is the statement made by John. Mark evidently supposed that the women, immediately on coming up, entered the sepulchre. Mary Magdalene certainly did not. Mark says they saw inside an angel sitting. Luke and John both mention two, and had Mark known that there were two, it is inconceivable that he should have mentioned only one. The address of the angel, as given by Mark, differs so widely from that in Luke, that they must be assumed to have been delivered on different occasions, whereas the two addresses, as reported by Matthew and Mark, are so nearly coincident, that they must be assumed to be the same. Then Mark tells us, "that they went out and fled from the sepulchre. They were filled with fear and astonishment, and said nothing to any man, for they were afraid." It is impossible to say what explanation Mark would have given, if he had continued the narrative. As it stands, it contains no trace that he knew anything of any appearance of our Lord as described by Matthew. The assertion that they fled from the sepulchre, and said nothing to any man, conveys the idea that they did not deliver the message with which they were charged at that time to the Apostles. As the distance from the sepulchre to the city must have been very short, the assertion that they fled and said nothing to any man almost precludes the possibility of their having met our Lord between the sepulchre and the city walls.

Matthew's narrative mentions the presence of several women at the last scene at Calvary, among whom he particularizes the two Mariés and Salomé. The two Mariés only are said to have been present at the funeral. He then informs us that at the dawn of the first day of the week, these two Mariés went to view the sepulchre, a great earthquake took place (*ἐγένετο*), an angel descended, approached, rolled away the stone from the door, and sat on it. His form was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. The guards shake from fear, and

became as dead. The angel addresses the women, Do not you fear (*μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς*). The address is nearly word for word the same as that in Mark. Going quickly with fear and great joy, they ran to deliver the angelic message to the disciples. As they go, Jesus meets them. They embrace him by the feet. He tells them not to fear, but to go and tell his disciples that they should meet him in Galilee.

This narrative is vague. It is far from clear whether the writer conceived the earthquake and the descent of the angel as having taken place in the presence of the women. The aorist tenses are used, leaving the meaning vague and indefinite. The general style of the narrative seems to imply that they saw the angel descend, and the guards shaking from fear. If this is not the intention of the writer, we must construe these aorists as if they were pluperfects. But there is another difficulty. The address of the angel to the women (*μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς*) Fear you not, with its emphatic "you," can hardly be understood as anything but an allusion to the presence of the trembling guards. It is most remarkable that Mark, who says nothing of the presence of the guards, characteristically omits the emphatic "you" (*ὑμεῖς*), and uses the pluperfect tense in reference to the rolling back of the stone, shewing that in his view of the case it was a passed act when the women arrived. On the other hand, if the women witnessed the earthquake and the descent of the angel, and the rolling back of the stone, the author must have considered that they were present at the moment of our Lord's resurrection also, for the rolling back of the stone must have preceded the resurrection itself. Which was the precise view taken by the evangelist is impossible to determine, except that the trembling guards must have still been present when the angel addressed *the women*. According to Matthew, the angel sat on the stone outside the sepulchre. The mode in which the narrative is put almost conveys the idea that he appeared in this form to the women as well as to the guards. But we are certain from John, that he did not so appear at the visit of Mary Magdalene. The narrative of Mark is also positive as to the fact, that the words here represented as spoken outside, were uttered inside the sepulchre. The narrative of Mark and Luke is so constructed as to suggest the idea that the women entered the sepulchre as soon as they arrived. Not only are they unaware of the fact that an angel had appeared to the women outside the sepulchre alluded to in their narratives, but the mode in which they have drawn them precludes it. On the other hand, the narrative of Matthew contains traces, that the words spoken by the angel were uttered inside the sepulchre. "Hither,

(*deûre*) see the place where the Lord lay," are very appropriate if spoken by a person inside the tomb, but very unsuited to a person sitting outside, especially when we consider that it was necessary to stoop down to look into the sepulchre. The next clause in Matthew's report seems to recognize the fact that the women had actually entered. "Having gone out quickly from the sepulchre, they ran to tell the disciples." The historical fact, therefore, appears to be that the women entered the sepulchre as soon as they arrived, and that none but the guards witnessed the descent of the angel, or his sitting on the stone. All this, however, is narrated by Matthew with such indistinctness as to leave no definite impression on the mind as to how the events occurred.

Matthew states that the object of the visit of the two Maries was to see the sepulchre (*θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον*). The natural meaning of these words is, that they went to take a view of the tomb. Nothing would be more probable than that some one would go to examine how matters were about the tomb, if a considerable party of women were coming for the purpose of embalming the body. This statement of Matthew entirely agrees with the narrative of John. But John mentions Mary Magdalene alone, and hardly leaves room for the supposition that she had a companion. On the other hand, the narratives of Mark and Luke represent both Maries as among the women who carried the spices, though the peculiar mode in which they are named in the latter narrative implies that the author was cautious as to distinctly saying that each of the women named states by him were thus employed. Instead of saying this, he that they were among those who told these things to the Apostles, an assertion which is consistent enough both with Matthew and John's account. Such a careful mode of expression is exactly in agreement with Luke's position, as a sifter of the testimony of others. The fact would seem to be that there were four women, the two Maries, Salome and Joanna, who were prominent in the transactions of that morning. With these several others, whose names are not given, were united. Some of these four in company with other women each of the synoptics have named as present at the events mentioned by them. They were the prominent characters, and busy in some portion of the scene. They have, therefore, introduced their names into the narrative without considering definitely what portion of it belonged to each. John's account is alone definite and distinct, and this agrees with his assertion that he was an eye witness of the facts.

Matthew mentions only the two Maries. But it is evident

that the words which the author of this Gospel states to have been uttered by the angels were not addressed to Mary Magdalene, for to suppose such to be the case, it is utterly inconsistent with John's testimony. If Mary Magdalene went alone, the words may have been addressed to the other Mary in company with other women, as stated by Mark; if so, this passage of Matthew must consist of three fragments.

Another remarkable statement of Matthew is that our Lord appeared to the women as they ran from the sepulchre, while the only two mentioned are the two Maries. "And behold Jesus met them, saying, Hail! but they coming up to him held him by the feet, and they worshipped him."

The grammatical structure of the passage ascribes this to the two Maries. We have already seen that the events previously mentioned cannot possibly have been seen by Mary Magdalene. It is no less evident that this appearance cannot possibly be reconciled with the circumstances of the appearance to her as described by John. According to him she saw angels in the tomb, but she was not in the act of conveying a message to the Apostles, nor was she going quickly from the tomb when she saw our Lord. She had run quickly from the sepulchre to bring information to Peter and John of the removal of the stone, but she had then seen no angels. Are we to suppose, then, that this was an appearance to the other Mary and other women not mentioned? The assertion of Mark that our Lord appeared first to Mary Magdalene is opposed to this. We know from John that he did not appear to her till after Peter and John had visited the sepulchre and her own return. If so, the interval between his appearing to Mary Magdalene and afterwards to the other women must have been so short, that his appearance to Mary Magdalene can hardly deserve the prominence which is given to it by Mark when he says that, when he was risen, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene. To justify these words it is necessary, also, that she should have been alone, as John describes her to have Mark also adds, that "she went and told these things to to those who were with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, hearing that he was living, and was seen by her, believed not." Here no mention is made of any message of a resurrection being conveyed to the Apostles by any other woman than Mary Magdalene. The following words seem positively to exclude it. "But after these things he appeared in another form to two of them, as they walked going into the country." These words prove that the author did not know of any other appearance to the women. The word *but* (δὲ) is opposed to *the appearing*

first to Mary Magdalene. It implies that the writer considered the second appearance of our Lord as that on the road to Emmaus. Cleopas also states that women of their company had been to the sepulchre, and returned, affirming that they had seen a vision of angels, who affirmed that he was alive. Is it credible, if these women had seen our Lord, that they would have spoken only of the vision of angels, and not of his personal appearance to them? If, again, our Lord appeared first to Mary Magdalene, it is impossible that the other Mary can have been in company with her. But if we suppose that Matthew's is a confused account of the appearance to Mary Magdalene, we have several points, more or less, agreeing with the exact account of it as given by John. Matthew agrees with John in representing her visit as undertaken for the purpose of observing the sepulchre. In John, Mary had rushed from the sepulchre previously, although she was not doing so when she saw our Lord, as is stated in Matthew. In John, Mary Magdalene is described as about to lay hold of his feet, and is forbidden to do so. In Matthew the two Maries have already embraced them. The expression in John, "My Father and your Father, my God and your God," is a joyful greeting, which may be represented by the words in Matthew, "Hail!" (*χαίρετε*) "do not fear," (*μὴ φοβεῖσθε*). In both Evangelists she is dismissed with a message to the Apostles. Both Evangelists, likewise, represent our Lord as calling the Apostles his "brethren." The words in Matthew may be an additional message beyond that recorded by John. If this is the case, we here meet with another instance of the doubling over of persons which we have already met with in this Evangelist. The passage presents every appearance of being another fragment.

Mark's description of the departure of the women represents them as running from the sepulchre under the influence of fear and astonishment. Matthew has fear and great joy. It is possible that among the women who witnessed the angelic apparition some may have been influenced by one feeling and some by the other. It is somewhat singular that our Lord is represented by Matthew as addressing them by the words, "Do not fear," as though fear, rather than joy, was their predominant feeling. This seems, undesignedly, to support the assertion of Mark.

The words of the angel as reported by Mark are so different from those given by Luke, as to preclude the possibility of their being two different versions of the same address. They coincide with those reported by Matthew. Neither agree with those which John asserts to have been spoken to Mary Magdalene. We have, therefore, three different angelic addresses;

that of Matthew and Mark, that of Luke, and that recorded by John. This proves that they must have been made to separate women, or parties of women. Now, although four only are named, the narratives of Mark and Luke assert that these were accompanied by several others. The impression produced is, that there are more who are not named than those who are. Nothing is, therefore, more probable than that the women entered the sepulchre in separate parties. The writers of the synoptics may not have been aware of this, but it can be inferred from the materials which they have put together. It may safely be affirmed that no mythologist would have composed a story encumbered with such difficulties, nor could myths which grew up spontaneously have presented us with such coincidences.

The last chapter of Matthew's Gospel is evidently of a very fragmentary description. It passes over all mention of our Lord's appearances to the Apostles at Jerusalem, and confines itself to the mention of one, it may be of two, appearances of our Lord in Galilee. "But the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, to the mountain where Jesus appointed them. And seeing him they worshipped him, but some doubted (*καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν*). And Jesus coming said to them, All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go, therefore; make disciples of all nations by baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, by teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

While this passage asserts that Jesus had appointed to meet the Apostles at a particular mountain, the Evangelist has not told us when or where that appointment was made. The angelic message had pointed out Galilee as the place of meeting, but no definite mountain there. Here the fragmentary nature of this portion of the Gospel is apparent, for we are forced by the conditions of the case to assume some prior meeting where this appointment was made. But its fragmentary character is still more apparent from what follows: "And seeing him they worshipped him, but some doubted." The persons who are described as seeing our Lord are the eleven Apostles. If we had no other information than that supplied by this Gospel we could come to no other conclusion but that when the eleven Apostles saw our Lord the majority of them believed, but that some of them doubted. Construed by the rules of grammar, this is the necessary meaning of the passage. All other interpretations are mere subterfuges for the purpose of avoiding an unpleasant

meaning. But that either of the Apostles doubted after the evidence which they had received of the reality of the resurrection before they left Jerusalem appears utterly impossible. We have only two alternatives. The passage either contains a misplaced allusion to Thomas, or, according to Mark and Luke, to some others of the disciples at the appearance on Easter day, and this placed in a wholly different connection; or the doubters must have been some others besides the eleven who were present, but whose presence is not recognized in the narrative, notwithstanding the fact that the rules of grammar require that the doubters should have been some of the eleven Apostles. We know from Saint Paul that there was an appearance of our Lord when he was seen by 500 brethren at once. This most probably took place in Galilee, and nothing is more likely than that out of so large a number some should have doubted. If that is the explanation of the difficulty, it is evident that the passage is of a most fragmentary character. The same inference, also, follows from the assumption that it refers to doubts expressed by Apostles on Easter day.

According to the strict structure of the narrative, the following discourse must have been delivered to the persons mentioned in the preceding passage, "And Jesus coming said to them, *i.e.*, to the persons who, when they saw him, believed, but some doubted."

It is remarkable that the conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel represents a somewhat similar discourse as delivered to the Apostles either on Easter day or the following Sunday. On this occasion unbelief was manifested, and our Lord is represented as reproaching them with it. The discourse as it stands in Matthew, and which is asserted to have been made to the eleven, is certainly more likely to have been made to them than to the 500. Still as the chapter is so evidently fragmentary, this may have been a fragment also, and spoken at a subsequent meeting in which none but the eleven were present. The Gospel then concludes, after alluding to two only—or, at most, three—appearances of our Lord, without any allusion to the ascension.

This chapter appears to be composed of six fragments. 1st, The visit of the two Maries to view the sepulchre. 2nd, The indefinite account of the events at the sepulchre. 3rd, The angel's address to a body of women, and their departure for the purpose of telling the Apostles. 4th, An indistinct account of an appearance to Mary Magdalene. 5th, The report of the guards to the priests. 6th, A meeting with 500 brethren mixed up with a meeting with the eleven Apostles. Perhaps the dis-

course to the eleven Apostles is a seventh and separate fragment. The conclusion of Mark's Gospel has also a strong appearance of being of a fragmentary character. If it is not viewed as such, but considered as a regular history, it places the ascension as having taken place on the evening of Easter day. It contains the appearance to Mary Magdalene, an allusion to the journey to Emmaus, the appearance to the twelve on Easter day. This is followed by a discourse which is grammatically closely connected with that appearance, and an allusion to the ascension, which the grammatical construction distinctly represents as taking place immediately after the discourse.

The author evidently wrote under a strong sense of the unbelief of the Apostles. They do not believe in Mary Magdalene's report of the resurrection. When our Lord appeared in another form to two of them as they went into the country, and they had reported the resurrection to the rest, "neither believed they them." When our Lord appeared to the eleven, as they sat at meat, "he reproached (*ὠνειδισεν*) them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they did not believe them who had seen him after he was risen." Very different is the view taken by Luke of the results of the reports of the two disciples from Emmaus:—"They found *the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.* And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread. And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said-unto them, Have ye here any meat?"

Now this proves to demonstration that the two writers report accounts entirely independent of each other. While they report what at bottom are the same facts, they take a different view of them. This affords a most satisfactory proof of the historical foundation of the facts themselves. It is evident by a mere juxtaposition of the passages, that the writer in Mark took a much stronger view of the unbelief of the disciples than Luke did. The account in Mark leads the reader to conclude, that the report of Cleopas and his companion was received with an universal unbelief by those to whom it was delivered. It may be

said to be a very concise account. So it is. But its conciseness renders such an impression inevitable. We find, however, that the full fact was, that there were persons present who were even prepared to believe in the reality of the resurrection from the report of Peter, without the corroboration afforded by the account of the two disciples. The words used by Luke forbid us to think that the believers present were few in number. In fact, the reader of Luke's narrative naturally concludes that the belief was almost as general as the unbelief is represented in Mark. Mark's narrative seems to be a fragment derived from the report of one who was at first an unbeliever, and he has attributed to others what he felt himself. We learn from Luke that others besides the eleven were present, and that our Lord's appearance took place while the two disciples were in the act of giving an account of what had taken place in their interview with him. Here, again, the impression produced by the narrative in Mark is that the first thing which our Lord did on his appearance was to reproach them with their unbelief; but we know, both from Luke and John, that the first words uttered by him were a salutation of peace. Luke tells us that his sudden apparition produced the impression that it was a spirit which they saw, as was not unnatural. Our Lord mildly expostulates with their fears, and affords them the most substantial evidence of his bodily resurrection. While they were still somewhat unconvinced, not from unbelief but joy, our Lord actually condescended to eat in their presence. All this is described by the reporter in Mark, as follows: "He reproached them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they did not believe those who had seen him after he was risen." The disagreement in view entertained by the two authors is most remarkable—a disagreement, however, which is a wonderful confirmation of the reality of the facts. It has been said that Mark's is a very abridged account. But this is so far from being an explanation, that it only shews that this impression of his meaning is inevitable from the mode in which the account is written. The real explanation seems to be that the passage is a fragment, derived from the report of one who was with difficulty persuaded to believe.

The discourse in Mark is so placed as to leave the impression on the reader's mind that it was delivered at our Lord's appearance to the eleven, after he had reproached them with their unbelief and hardness of heart. The connecting words are, "And he said to them." The ascension also is placed as immediately following the discourse. The Lord after speaking to them was received up. (*Ὁ μὲν οὖν Κύριος μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς ἀνελήφθη.*) It

is highly probable that the discourse was spoken at or near the time of the ascension, but that the ascension did not take place on Easter day is certain, nor is it probable that the discourse was delivered on that day. It is more remarkable that a somewhat similar discourse is represented by Luke as having been uttered by our Lord on the same occasion, and the ascension is represented in his Gospel as immediately following its delivery, although he states this differently in the Acts of the Apostles. We must place the Gospel and the Acts in juxtaposition. After having eaten before the disciples, Luke describes our Lord as saying, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures. And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high. And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." In the Acts we read: "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach. Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen: to whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: and, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. . . . When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth. And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up."

Such is Luke's second account of the ascension, composed

some time after he had written the first. If the reader had only his Gospel, he would be unable to avoid arriving at the conclusion that the discourse was delivered on the evening of the resurrection, and that it was immediately followed by the ascension. If this were his sense, Luke writes grammatically, but commentators have little scruple to sacrifice his grammar, when they think they can improve his sense, and then they say that he means something quite different from what the natural order of his words convey. In the Acts, he distinctly informs us that the ascension took place forty days after the resurrection, and that our Lord in the meantime had several discourses with the Apostles respecting the things pertaining to the kingdom of heaven. It is very possible, therefore, that several discourses to the same effect as those in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, may have been delivered in the course of the forty days, and that these discourses are a general summary of them. But taking the phenomena as they stand, and supposing the authors of these Gospels to have used perspicuous and grammatical language, it seems hardly possible to resist the inference that both writers, when they wrote these passages, would conclude that their readers would understand that the discourses and the ascension took place on Easter evening. To suppose that the author intended to represent a day or more to have elapsed between such an expression as, "taking, he ate before them," and "But he said to them:" or that the writer meant to imply that another interval took place between the expressions, "Then opened he their understandings," etc., and the following words, "And he said to them," or the words, "Ye are witnesses of these things," and "And behold I send the promise of my father upon you," or the concluding words of this promise, and the words, "And he led them out to Bethany," etc., is to charge the Evangelist with inability to express himself with perspicuity in the most ordinary use of language. The far more reverent conclusion is, that a considerable body of Christians thought that the ascension followed the resurrection on Easter day, an opinion which the author of the fragment in Mark followed, as well as Luke himself, and that hath so placed the previous discourse as to meet this view of the case; but that the subsequent inquiries of Luke led him to arrive at the distinct statement of the Acts. Such a view bears out Luke's express statement in the Gospel, that he wrote after having instituted the best inquiry into the fact which he was able.

The historical accuracy of Luke's account of the journey to Emmaus is strongly supported by the fragment in Mark, which is evidently reported from a distinct source. The account of

the journey itself, as given by Luke, has the strongest evidence of historical accuracy, and is reported in such language, as to lead us to infer that it was derived from one of the two disciples themselves. His account of the results of the visit of the women to the sepulchre is also in the strictest conformity with the description of an eye-witness. We must notice the chief points. The distance of Emmaus to Jerusalem is distinctly given. Cleopas and his companion were discoursing about the events which had just occurred. Their discussion was carried on in an earnest manner (*ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ συζητεῖν*). They were "discoursing and discussing." These words imply the existence of a difference of opinion between the two. While they were thus engaged, Jesus approaches and joins them. Their eyes were holden. He addresses them, "What are these reasonings, which you are maintaining one against the other (*τίνας οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους*) as ye walk sadly?" Cleopas replies—"Do you *lodge alone* in Jerusalem (*σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς*), and do not know what has happened in it in these days?" Jesus—"What kind of things?" Cleopas and his companion—"The things about Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet mighty in word and deed before God and all the people, and how our chief priests and rulers have delivered him to judgment of death, and have crucified him. But we hoped that he was he who was about to redeem Israel. And besides all this, this day is the third day from the time that these things took place. But also certain women from among us astonished us, being early at the sepulchre, and not having found his body, they came, saying, that they had seen a vision of angels who said that he was alive. And some also of those among us went to the sepulchre, and found there as the women had said, but him they saw not." Jesus—"O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." These last words are the nearest to those in Mark, who asserts that Jesus reproached them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, but there it is the eleven who are reproached. Mark's statement is, however, a strong corroboration of Luke's facts, as shewing that there were persons among the disciples to whom these strong words were applicable, although the occasion is misplaced by him. It is most remarkable, however, that these two persons who had been thus reproached were actually in the room at the time, when and where Mark represents the reproach as having been uttered, while the real state of the fact was, that they had been reproached previously, and that they reported the fact of their having been thus reproached to the assembled disciples. This is a wonderfully undesigned coincidence, which is

alone sufficient to establish the historical accuracy of the entire account. Our Lord kept explaining (*διηρμήνευεν*) the Old Testament Scriptures as to the things concerning himself. Similarly, also, our Lord was making as if he would go further (*προσποιεῖτο* a strong term). They constrained him. So again in the breaking of bread, *ἐπενδίδου* denoting a repeated act. They recognize him and he becomes invisible, and they exclaim, Was not our heart burning within us, as he spoke to us on the road, and unfolded the Scriptures to us? On returning to Jerusalem, they find the eleven and those who were with them assembled, saying (*λέγουσας*), The Lord is risen again, etc. Then follows the account of the appearance to which we have already referred. This account is marked with the strongest traits of an eye-witness, and both of them closely point to Cleopas as Luke's authority.

Luke's account of the visit of the women to the sepulchre closely agrees with that which Cleopas gives of it to our Lord. The visit in both cases was made by several women. They go early (*ῥῆθροναι*, says Cleopas: *ῥῆθρον βαθέος*, according to Luke). Not finding his body, says Cleopas (*μὴ εὑροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα*); and entering they found not the body (*οὐχ εὑραν τὸ σῶμα*) says Luke. Cleopas says, they came saying that they had seen a vision of angels; Luke says, they saw two; Cleopas adds, who said that "he was alive." Luke says that the angels said, "Why seek ye him who lives among the dead?" Some of their body went to the tomb, and found things as the women had said. Cleopas here uses the plural number. He may put the case generally, or have heard of the joint visit of Peter and John. Luke says that Peter found things as thus stated. Cleopas says, "Him they saw not." Luke tells us that Peter returned wondering, and John implies that he did not return believing. Not one word is said of any alleged appearance of our Lord to the women. This is natural enough if Mary Magdalene was the only one to whom he had appeared; for the appearance to her took place after Peter's visit. From the distance, Cleopas and his companion must have left Jerusalem not later than the middle of the day. If our Lord appeared to Mary Magdalene alone, and she had to go round to the different disciples with the message, Cleopas might full well have not heard her message before he left. But when his account is so minute, it is very improbable, if the women who reported that they had seen a vision of angels, who said that he was risen, had said that they had also seen our Lord, that he would have omitted all mention of it. Of such an appearance Luke's account likewise knew nothing.

Luke's and John's accounts, drawn as they are from sources

evidently and entirely distinct, form as strong a corroboration of the truth of the resurrection as the attestation of any event recorded in history. John was present, and his account reflects his own feelings. He had already become a believer in the resurrection. His narrative is accordingly destitute of every expression of wonder or surprise. It is distinct and clear. But Luke's inquiries led him to tell us when Jesus stood in the midst, that they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that the appearance was a spirit, and that our Lord reasoned with them on the certainty of his bodily reality. John tells us, without noticing that there was any occasion for our Lord's doing so, that he shewed the disciples his hands and his side. Luke adds that he shewed his hands and feet, and that while they were still incredulous from joy and were wondering, he asked them for food, and on their producing it, he ate before them a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honeycomb. Then fear is alluded to in John by the second address made to the disciples of "Peace be unto you." John says that he breathed on the Apostles, and said to them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Luke states that "he opened their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures," an evident allusion to the same event by different witnesses. No less remarkable is the mutual attestation given by these two Gospels to Peter and John's visit to the sepulchre, in the peculiar expression used by each of them to denote their going home. Peter and John return "to themselves" (*ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς*). Peter, in Luke, returns "to himself" (*ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτόν*). This most peculiar expression united with a testimony to exactly the same facts, mixed with variation in the particulars, is one of the most satisfactory proofs of historical veracity, quite unlike the mode of narration adopted by inventors, or the form in which stories spring up in myths.

St. John's Gospel contains an account of a second appearance of our Lord to the Apostles in the following week describing the unbelief, and the subsequent conviction of Thomas. We probably catch an echo of it in Mark. As it stands in John, the whole narrative wears the strongest appearance of naturalness. The supplement of the Gospel, whether it be by John's hand or another, contains a circumstantial account of a third appearance of our Lord made to seven of the Apostles, which presents strong indications of an historic character. His narrative concludes without noticing the ascension, but with an assertion, twice repeated, that the incidents reported by him are selections from a much larger number of events made by him with the definite purpose of giving satisfactory evidence that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

This survey of the fourfold account of the resurrection leads us to the following conclusions:—1st. That the account given by John is the direct testimony of himself and Mary Magdalene of what they heard and saw. 2nd. That this testimony receives the strongest confirmation of its historical accuracy, when it is compared with that of Luke, whose account bears the appearance of having been derived from direct testimony, narrated with the care of a writer who claims to have used circumspection in ascertaining the truth of what he wrote. This account seems mainly to rest on the ocular testimony of Cleopas and of the women who were his informants. 3rd. Of the subsequent events Luke seems not to have had such precise information when he wrote his Gospel, as he had become possessed of when he wrote the Acts. 4th. The accounts in Matthew and Mark are fragmentary, each fragment having a character of its own, and in various ways affording distinct confirmation of the substantial accounts of the other two Evangelists. 5th. Considerable variations exist in the accounts. These seem to have been caused by their having originated in narrations made by different women who had witnessed different circumstances, and who were in too excited a state of mind to be definite about the particulars of an occurrence. Such variations are natural if the reports are accounts of real events, and form a far stronger confirmation of their truth than if they had flowed on with uniform conformity. Those in Matthew have the appearance of having passed through transmissions prior to having been recorded in writing. 6th. The whole narrative is strikingly corroborated by a number of allusions in one to events mentioned in another more or less remote, but entirely beyond the invention of a forger. 7th. The authors of the Gospels appear to have made no effort to harmonise the events of the resurrection, or to have rounded them into a whole, but to have set them down just as they heard them narrated, with the exception of John, who almost entirely narrates his own direct testimony. 8th. The account in Matthew as a history of the resurrection is strikingly incomplete. It cannot possibly be supposed to contain the whole testimony of Matthew on that subject, and it stands in marked contrast to the fulness of the description which he gives of the passion. Unless we assume that it consists of fragments, its entire omission of all mention of the great appearances to the Apostles is unaccountable. Its whole phenomena are hard to reconcile with its being the direct product of the pen of an Apostle. 9th. The concluding portion of the last chapter in Mark is wanting in the graphic and circumstantial detail with which the former portion

of this Gospel abounds. Its external character strongly militates against its having been written by the same hand as the remainder of the Gospel. Lastly, the whole of the narratives of the resurrection present none of the usual traits of myths, but all the usual phenomena which arise when a considerable number of witnesses give separate accounts of the same event, before their smaller divergencies have been smoothed over by a skilful compiler.

The historical certainty of the following events connected with the resurrection rests on an amount of testimony which is hardly possessed by any event before the invention of printing:—1st. Mary Magdalene's visit to the sepulchre, and her discovering that the tomb was empty. 2nd. A visit of one or more parties of women to the sepulchre, who made a similar discovery by actual inspection. 3rd. Two angels seen in the sepulchre by Mary Magdalene. 4th. Two angels seen in the sepulchre by other women. 5th. One angel by others. 6th. The sepulchre found empty by Peter and John, the linen clothes seen by them lying there, and the napkin wrapt up by itself. 7th. Our Lord seen and conversed with by Mary Magdalene. 8th. Our Lord seen and conversed with by two disciples for a considerable time. 9th. His appearance to Peter. 10th. His appearance on the evening of Easter-day to ten Apostles and other disciples. 11th. His appearance to eleven Apostles on the following Sunday. 12th. A subsequent appearance to seven apostles. 13th. An appearance to eleven Apostles on the day of his ascension. Various discrepancies appear in connection with minor points, but these divergencies of statement, when diligently sifted, are of such a nature, that instead of weakening, they strengthen the historic evidence of the facts.

(To be continued.)

DIFFICULT PASSAGES IN JOB.

(Continued from Vol. VIII., page 379.)

CHAP. XVI. 21. The English version here renders a very intelligible meaning, but it is not the sense of the original. Verses 19—21, should be thus translated: "Also now, behold! in heaven is my witness, and supporter on high. My friends are mockers, mine eye pours out tears to God (Eloah). And he may decide for a man against God (Eloah), and the son of man with his neighbour." The appeal is here from Eloah to Eloah, from God in His anger, to God in His mercy; and the writer means, that though afflicted on earth, he has a testimony in heaven, and that, while his friends condemn him as guilty, he can with confidence look up to God in heaven. So while one man can judge the cause of another, God alone can judge His own. He alone can know the heart, and tell for what cause the chastisement is sent. In verse 21, therefore, the contrast is between God as the decider in His own cause and man in his, not, as from the English version, we might suppose, between the impossibility of pleading before God and the opportunity of doing so before men.

Chap. xvii. 6. "He hath made me also a bye-word; and *aforetime I was as a tabret.*" So is the latter part of this verse rendered in the English verse, and the meaning which it suggests must be, that now Job was an object of reproach, as formerly he had been a cause of rejoicing. And perhaps such a figure of speech might be suitable if the words of the text allowed; but they do not. The meaning the Hebrew gives, connects the latter part of the verse much better with the former. The word תִּפְתֹּת means according to Hitzig "a horror" (monstrum), according to Gesenius and Delitzsch "a spitting," and is derived from תִּפֵּן "to spit on." It would seem that the English translators had either mistaken תִּפְתֹּת for תִּפֵּן (tympanum), or had that reading. The rendering of the latter clause of the verse should be, "and I was a spitting of the face," i.e., one in whose face people did spit,—a thing held most vile and contemptible.

Chap. xviii. 18, 14. "It shall devour the parts of his skin (i.e., the limbs of his body); *the first born of death shall devour his limbs.* His confidence shall be torn away from his tent, and *thou leadest him down to the king of terrors.*"

There is an evident correspondence between the last clauses

of these two verses. The expression, "the first born of death," is most forcibly and poetically significant of disease, more especially of that form of disease from which Job probably was suffering, elephantiasis, which destroys and eats up the skin. Diseases are the oldest born children of death, and they lead the sufferer down to the realm of their parent, death, which is here personified (as Isaiah xxviii. 15, and Psalm xlix. 15), and called "the king of terrors." It is not an unlikely conjecture which has been made, that by this term, "king of terrors," an allusion is made to Satan, "him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. ii. 14). In Jewish theology Satan is called among other names *אֵלֶּיֶתְהוּ* (the prince over Thohu, or chaos). Death is here the "king," whose "first born" is disease.

Verse 20. Instead of "They that come after him shall be astonished at his day, as they that went before were affrighted," the words should rather be rendered "*They that dwell in the west are astonished at his day, they that dwell in the east are affrighted,*" lit. "lay hold on horror." The inhabitants of the world on all sides, west and east, shall be moved when they hear of the chastisements of the wicked. It could scarcely be said that "they that went before" could be affrighted at events which were still to take place; and it would be forced to understand by this expression, the contemporaries of Job. The other rendering gives a much clearer meaning.

Chap. xix. 20. "I am escaped with the skin of my teeth." This is sometimes understood as a proverbial expression for "I have escaped just with my life," *vitam solam et nudam exportare*. But this does not agree with the context. Job is recounting his bodily sufferings, and so far from thinking he has just escaped the jaws of death, he regards his sickness as fatal, and himself therefore as dying. Gesenius takes the expression as a proverb, and interprets it "*vix sani quidquam superest in corpore meo.*" But this meaning is too vague and general to be satisfactory. It is better, therefore, to take the words in their strict sense, and not as proverbial. Job has been describing the effects of his disease, his fetid breath (v. 17), and his miserable leanness, in the first clause of this verse (20). Then he mentions another effect of his loathsome ailment, viz., that his teeth fall out of his gums. Delitzsch understands the words to mean that the gums have so sunk away from the teeth that the membrane round the teeth alone remained to them. In any case, the expression to be taken as speaking of a bodily ailment, and not as a proverbial saying.

Verse 25—27. This is “locus classicus” of this book. It is the passage which has been regarded as *the* text in the Old Testament Scriptures, which proves that the belief in “the resurrection of the body” was held, at least, in the time of the author of the book of Job. Much controversy, therefore, has settled itself round this well-known passage. It will be most satisfactory, without entering on the theological question more than is unavoidable, to give, first, as exact a translation of the verses as can be; next to consider the meaning of some of the different words used here; and then, the connection of the passage with the context. Our version, though in the main correct, does not give the meaning quite literally, but is perhaps coloured somewhat with the traditional interpretation assigned to the passage. Closely translated the verses mean, “I know that my Redeemer or Avenger (*Goel*, about which word something will be said below) liveth, and the Last one, he will arise on the dust, and after my skin, (they) destroy this, and away from my flesh I shall behold God (Eloah): whom I shall see to myself (*i.e.*, for my good) and mine eyes shall behold, and not a stranger, my reins yearn in my bosom.” Such is a literal rendering of the passage, which certainly does not give so clear and decided a sense as our well-known English one, but may enable a person to form perhaps a better judgment as to the meaning of the author. I will discuss now the interpretation to be put on some of the words. And first as to the Hebrew word which is rendered Redeemer, viz., גֹּאֵל (*Goel*). It occurs in many places in the Old Testament, generally with the addition דָּם (the blood), as Numb. xxxv. 19; Deut. xix. 6, 12; Josh. xx. 3; 2 Sam. xiv. 11, and with the omission דָּם, Numb. xxxv. In this sense “*Goel*” is “an Avenger.” The same word is used Ruth iii. 12, for one who redeems a pledge, where it is translated in the English Bible “kinsman.” The rendering “Redeemer” would be the best in the place under consideration, except that it may lead us to attach a higher import than belongs to the original word. Job does not speak of God as his Redeemer in the high sense in which that term belongs to Him alone; but he calls Him his *Goel*, inasmuch as he felt sure God would preserve his good name and made clear his innocence hereafter. The next word, אַחֲרָי, stands in apposition with “*Goel*,” and cannot be rendered “at the latter day.” Some have interpreted it to mean “vindex,” or “after-man,” in the sense of one who seconds another. It is rather an appellation of God Himself, and signifies “the last,” “postremus, novissimus.” (Cf. Isaiah xlv. 6, where both the

words גֹּאֲלִי and אֶחָרִי are used.) The next word to be discussed is nearly as important as these two to the right meaning of the passage. It is rendered in the English version "on the earth," but Hebrew has two other words for "the earth," neither of which is here used. The word employed עֶפֶר signifies "dust," and does not mean here the dust of the earth, but the dust to which man returns in the grave. So is the word used in chapters xvii. 16; xx. 11; xxi. 26 of this book, and Psalm xxx. 10. The sense then is, that he, his justifier and the Last, will raise Himself up on the dust to which Job is about to return, and will assert his innocency when Job is gone away. If this be the right interpretation of עַל-עֶפֶר, then we cannot find in these words, so far, the hope expressed of a resurrection of the flesh, and the words which follow, though in our version ("and in my flesh shall I see God") they seem to bear that meaning, require another translation. For the preposition is not "in" ב, but "from," or "apart from," מִ, (מִבְּשָׁרִי) and the meaning is rather "*apart from my flesh shall I see God*" (Eloah) than "*in my flesh.*" The words which follow, "whom I shall see for myself and *mine eyes* shall behold," are difficult to understand, on the supposition that Job merely intended in this remarkable declaration to assert a general belief that God would at some time bring his innocence to light. The passage means surely a great deal more than this, though the ancient interpretation which assigns a declaration of belief in the resurrection of the flesh may go too far. Taking the words in connection with the context, we may (I think) regard them as expressing a firm belief in a justification of his innocence hereafter, and a conviction that *he himself* shall in some way be conscious of it. In verses 23, 24, Job expresses the fervent wish that what he had said and was now saying might be written as a memorial of his case for future generations to judge betwixt him and his adversaries. Nay, he wishes it were written indelibly, "graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever," as an inscription; and then he expresses his firm conviction that One liveth, the last as well as the first, who shall maintain his cause, and shall rise up, as it were, on the very dust to which he shall return in the grave. And though after his skin shall be destroyed, even then, deprived of his body, he should see God. And this vision of God should be made known to himself directly and conscious of identity; for which justification his reins in his bosom, or within him, did yearn. Such may be taken as a paraphrase of this passage. And though Job does not profess his belief in the resurrection

of the body, he declares his conviction that God will, after his death, maintain his cause, as the cause of all His true servants, and that he himself shall know it. We may perceive the germs of a belief in a future state which shall be a rectification of the inequalities of this, as also a notion, though a dim and uncertain one, as compared with the Christian's faith of a future seeing God "face to face."

Verse 29. This verse is connected with the preceding. Job warns his rebukers, if they still doubt his innocence, and continue to slander him, that they will fall under the wrath of God, and be guilty of a crime, false witness, which is amenable to the punishment of the sword. The verse should be thus rendered, according to Delitzsch, "Be afraid of the sword, because wrath (*i.e.*, of God) (strikes) crimes of the sword (*i.e.*, capital crimes, such as blasphemy, false witness), in order that ye may know there is a judgment." This translation brings the verse into connection with what has gone before.

Chap. xx. 11. The English version has here supplied words which are not in the Hebrew, and which give a different sense from that in the original. It is rendered, "His bones are full of the sin of his youth." But it is not necessary to supply the words in italics, as the passage gives a very good meaning without them, and indeed the addition mars the sense and the grammar of the second clause of the verse, for there is no relative "*which*" in the Hebrew, but the conjunction "*and*." The passage should be rendered thus: "His bones were full of youthful vigour: it (*viz.*; his youth) shall lie down with him in the dust." The writer is speaking of the wicked being cut off in the flower of their age. The Septuagint has given this meaning, 'Ὅσα αὐτοῦ ἐνεπλήσθη νεότητος αὐτοῦ, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ χώματος κοιμηθήσεται; while Jerome and the Vulgate have the same rendering as the English version, "Ossa ejus implebuntur vitiis adolescentiæ ejus, et cum eo in pulvere dormient." But the addition of this word "*vitiis*" alters and spoils the sense.

Verse 21. Delitzsch gives what seems to be a better and closer rendering of this verse than the one in the English version, though Hupfeld adopts one very similar to ours, *viz.*, "Nihil et superstes ad vescendum, itaque non durant bona ejus." But עָרַץ means escaped, "*elapsum*," and the meaning will be this: "Nothing has escaped his devouring, therefore shall not his prosperity continue." The rendering in the English version, "therefore shall no man look on his goods," is incorrect.

Chap. xxii. 20. This verse is thus rendered in the English

version, "Whereas our substance is cut down, but the remnant of them the fire consumeth," which comes into no sort of connection with the context. The speaker, Eliphaz the Temanite, is remarking on the certain destruction which will in time overtake the evil-doers who "said unto God, Depart from us," and on the joy of the righteous at this just judgment, and this verse is the expression of their feelings at the time. It should be translated thus, "Shall not our adversary be brought to nought, and the fire consume the remnant of them?" So rendered, its connection with what has gone before is quite plain.

At verse 24 a more literal and a better rendering is given in the margins of our Bibles than in the text. It cannot be translated, "Shalt lay up gold as dust," for then the word must be על , whereas it is עליו , i.e., "upon." The verse literally is, "And layest gold ore on the dust and Ophir in the stones of the brooks." And the meaning is, if thou puttest away from thee—utterly despisest—gold in comparison with God's favour, the result of this faith shall be an ample recompense from the Almighty, as declared in the next verse, which should thus be rendered, "And the Almighty (Shaddai) shall be thy gold ore and the brightness of silver to thee."

Verse 30. The word of the Hebrew (נִקְיָא), which in our version is rendered "island," is rather to be regarded in this place as the negative, than the substantive which has that meaning, $\text{נִקְיָא} = \text{נִקְיָא} = \text{נִקְיָא}$, so Delitzsch, Gesenius. The words must then be understood to signify "the not innocent, i.e., the guilty, and the results of a turning to God and of humility are declared. And the meaning will be, "He shall deliver the not-guilty, and by the innocency of his hands he shall be delivered," i.e., he shall be counted as one innocent in the sight of God. But Delitzsch prefers to understand the latter clause of the verse as relating to others; and he takes it to mean that for the sake of one who has so turned to God and humbled himself, others shall be delivered. He makes reference to our Lord's words to St. Peter (St. Luke xxii. 32). So some former commentators have understood the words, "liberabit Dominus et propter puritatem manuum tuarum alios, quos propria innocentia ipsos deficiens non esset liberatura." Neither the Septuagint nor Jerome seems to have had the נִקְיָא , for they render the first clause simply as "the innocent," *Πύσεται δὲ ἀθῶον, καὶ διασωθήσῃ ἐν καθαρῇ χειρὶ σου.* "Salvabitur innocens, salvabitur autem in munditia manuum suarum."

Chap. xxiii. 17. The thought contained in this verse is somewhat difficult to unravel. The construction of the Hebrew is

quite plain, and the English version has rendered it literally, but the sense is not clear. There are two meanings which may probably be attached to this passage. The one is that Job is perplexed and troubled at the thought, that God had not cut him off before this great darkness of trouble was allowed to come over his soul—cut him off on the day of his birth (see chap. iii. 2), or at all events before these great calamities overtook him, and so “darkness covered his face.” The other is, that his heart is perplexed, not by reason of the darkness of sorrow which envelops him, not on account of the covering of affliction which is now spread over him—this he might endure—but what he cannot understand is, the reason of God’s hostile dealing with him. It is by means of this incomprehensible way of dealing with him that “God maketh his heart soft, and the Almighty troubleth him” (v. 16.). Delitzsch prefers this latter mode of interpretation to the other. I confess that the first mentioned (which is that of some of the older commentators) appears to me to afford the most simple and intelligible sense.

Chap. xxiv. 1. This cannot be called exactly a difficult passage, but the position of the negative in the English version somewhat obscures the sense, and also the word “seeing” has nothing corresponding to it in the Hebrew. The verse literally rendered is, “Why are times not hidden from the Almighty (Shaddai), and they who know Him, do not see his days”—i.e., “Why is it, since God foreseeth all things, that his true servants do not see his judgments on the earth, recompense to the just, punishment to the wicked?” An inquiry which has suggested itself to the minds of thoughtful heathens in every age.

Verse 11. From verse 2 the writer has been speaking of the violent deeds of wicked oppressors. At verse 5 he refers to the lawless tribes of Bedouin bandits, whom he compares to wild asses—the “onagri.” At verse 11 he describes the condition of the cruelly oppressed captives, who are forced to work at the oil presses (the work of slaves) within the walled inclosures of their masters. They are made also to tread their wine-presses in the heat of the day, and when suffering thirst, are not allowed to drink of the juice which is produced by their labours. The beauty of this graphic description need not be pointed out.

Verse 16. Instead of “which they had marked for themselves in the daytime,” this clause of the verse should be rendered, “In the day they shut up themselves.” The meaning of course is, that these men who rob in the night-time, by day hide themselves in their lurking places from the eyes of men. They hate and avoid the light at all times, and are therefore not to be seen in the day. So Job goes not to say in verse 17,

that "the morning is to them as the shadow of death," which translation gives a good sense, and one which the words allow, though some render the passage, "And night is to them as morning break," *i. e.*, the season of their unholy work. The last clause should be translated, "for they know the shadow of death," *i. e.*, a sense of guilt is ever present with them. The rendering of our version, "if one knows them," does not give the sense of the passage, and is, moreover, inconsistent with what was said in the preceding verse, that they conceal themselves in the daytime.

Chap. xxvi. 5. As this verse stands in the English version the sense is somewhat obscure, "Dead things are formed from under the waters and their inhabitants." Now it would obviously occur to ask, how can dead things be formed or born? But the word "Rephaim" means sometimes "giants," "monsters," sometimes "the spirits of the departed," "manes." In this place, therefore, it may signify either the monsters of the deep, or the inhabitants of the invisible world, in which case it would stand in close connection with verse 6, where it is positively declared that Scheol or Hades is naked before God, and that Abaddon, or the place of destruction, is uncovered to his sight. Bildad had in the foregoing chapter spoken of God's power in the high places. Job carries on the subject, and declares that his power is not confined to the "high places" (xxv. 2), but reaches to the world of spirits—to Scheol and Abaddon.

Verse 12. The rendering of רָחַב (*rahab*) by "the proud, or pride" (see margin) in English version confuses the sense. The Sept. gives τὸ κῆτος. It signifies a sea monster of some kind, and is an emblem of Egypt (see Israel li. 9). In this passage (as most probably this book was written either in Egypt, or by one familiar with the country and its products) the word may be taken to signify the "crocodile."

Verse 13. "The crooked serpent" should rather be rendered "the flying serpent." The Sept. has δράκοντα ἀποστάτην. Jerome "coluber tortuosus." By the flying serpent is meant one of the constellations, most likely the one between Ursa Major and Ursa Minor, viz., the constellation of Draco, or the Scorpion. By the Arabs it is called "el-hajje," *i. e.*, the snake. Virgil speaks of it thus, *Georg.*, i., 244-6:—

"Maximus hic flexu sinuoso elabitur Anguis
Circum, perque duas in morem fluminis Arctos,
Arctos Oceani metuentes æquore tingui."

Chap. xxvii. 19. If this passage be rendered with the

English version, "The rich man lieth down and *shall not be gathered*," we must understand "shall not be gathered to his fathers," i. e., "shall not be buried," in accordance with an usual Scriptural expression, and this is the interpretation of Rosenmüller and some others. And then the meaning of the latter clause of the verse, "he openeth his eyes and is not," will be that his awakening takes place in the world of spirits or shadows. But the first and second parts of the verse do not thus very well accord. Jerome has "*divos cum dormierit, nihil secum auferet*," which gives a good sense, but then one misses in the original the word *כִּלְכִּל* = "anything," which must be supplied to make up the meaning. The rendering of the Sept. is more literal and better, *πλούσιος κοιμηθεὶς οὐ προσθήσει*, and the meaning will then be, "the rich man lies down in sleep and doest nothing more, since in the night he is deprived by a sudden death, both of his life and his riches."

Chap. xxviii. 3, 4, 5. These are certainly two very difficult verses as they stand in the English version. Before translating them it may be necessary to observe the connection between this chapter and the foregoing one. It seems to be this:—Job has just described the sudden death of the rich man taken away from the midst of his riches, and then his thoughts turn to a mode through which wealth is heaped up, viz., by the gaining from the earth its precious stones hidden in its bosom. And so he graphically describes the work of the miners. The verses 3 and 4 rendered more closely will give the following meaning:—"He setteth an end to darkness, and to all the recesses he searcheth, the stone of darkness and of the shadow of death," i. e., the miner by breaking up the earth and sinking a shaft brings to light the precious stones, which he searches after to the remotest corner, so that the most deeply hidden jewel is brought out. Then the writer goes on at verse 4 to describe more in detail the operation of the miner, "He breaketh (i. e., sinketh) a shaft far from the inhabitant (i. e., of the earth); they forgotten (i. e. the miners) hang under the feet of men; they are poised." Then Job speaks of the purposes for which the earth is used by man, that not contented with obtaining food from its surface, its very bowels were upturned, as if by the operation of a volcano. "The earth—out of it cometh bread, and its underpart is upturned like fire."

Chap. xxix. 4. The expression "As I was in the days of my youth," offers no difficulty, and yet is not an accurate rendering of the original. It should rather be, "as I was in the days of my harvest," i. e., in the prime of my manly vigour, "*diebus*

maturitatis meæ," as Gesenius gives it. If Job had meant the days of his youth it would have been אֲבִי יָמַי and not יָמַי יְרֵסִי. The Septuagint has *ὅτε ἤμην ἐπιβλήτων ὁδοῦς*. The difference, perhaps, between the strictly literal rendering and our version is not important, but there seems more force in the former, as Job proceeds to enumerate the blessings of his state of greatest prosperity. It would also make the meaning of the last clause plainer to substitute "confidence" or "trust" for "secret."

Verse 18. "I shall multiply my days as the sand" is a usual Scriptural figure of speech (also a heathen one, quot haberet corpora pulvis, Tot mihi natales contingere vana rogavi. Ovid, *Metap.*, xiv. 136). Delitzsch prefers the interpretation given by Jewish commentators to the word חֹלִל viz., "the phoenix," and perhaps the expression "I shall multiply my days as the phoenix," may agree better with the preceding clause, "I shall die in my nest." But the other rendering is preferred by most modern commentators. The Septuagint renders the words "ὥσπερ στῆλεχος φοῖνικος," the word φοῖνιξ signifying both the fabulous bird of that name, and also the palm tree, the emblem of perpetual youth; comp. Psalm xcii. 12.

Chap. xxx. 2. "Whereto might the strength of their hands profit me, *in whom old age is perished*." As Job is speaking of the "younger" than himself, and not of their fathers, we should not expect the mention of "old age;" moreover, when old age "is perished," life is over. And it is not the meaning of Job that these persons did not profit, because they are dead. The verse should be rendered thus: "Also the strength of their hands, to what purpose is it to me? to them their vigour is perished," קָלַח = "perfectio," and so "vigor." The Septuagint may have this sense ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀπώλετο συντέλεια. Verse 4 should be translated, "For want and famine they are hungered, fleeing to the wilderness, the darkness of the waste and desert."

Verse 24. This verse would be comparatively easy to interpret, if we were justified in making a slight alteration in the text. But there does not seem any authority for the change.

It has been proposed instead of לָהֶם "for them," to read לְחַן "for mercy." As the passage stands, the following seems the most intelligible sense; though it is not proposed as a quite satisfactory translation. "Does not one stretch out the hand in vain? does not one in trouble cry out *in it*?" לָהֶן which is fem., is here taken in a neuter signification. If we might

follow the conjecture referred to, then the sense would be "does not one in trouble cry out for mercy," which would of course give a clear meaning.

Chap. xxxi. 31. The meaning of this passage, which appears obvious enough, has been strangely misunderstood. One stumbling block seems to have been that the interpreters have supposed "his flesh" to relate to the person of Job. Thus the Septuagint translators have rendered the words as if they would express that his servants were so devoted to their master that they could eat him up! *Εἰ δὲ καὶ πολλάκις εἶπον αἱ θεράπωναι μου, τίς ἂν δόξη ἡμῖν τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ πλησθῆναι; Λαν μου χρηστοῦ ὄντος;* others, as Drusius in *Crit. Sac.*, have understood the wish as an expression of the enemies of Job, who secretly nourished the revengeful wish to eat him up! And yet it is said "the men of my tent," i.e., his servants, etc. But it is needless to point out how this last-mentioned interpretation disagrees with the whole context. Jerome has taken a much more rational view of the meaning of the passage, but has missed the full sense of it. He explains thus "*Pro hospitalitatibus ejus et virtute, qua et cæteri sancti Deo placuerunt, odium servorum contraxerat.*" The verse should be translated and explained as follows:—"If the men of my tent have not said, Would that we had of his flesh—we are not satisfied," i.e., his provisions and fare are so excellent, we do not get sated with them as we should with coarser food.

Verse 85. "Oh! would there were a hearer for me—behold my sign (or signature): may the Almighty hear me, and the writing my adversary has written," i.e., Job desires one to hear his cause, and he produces his own defence, and the accusation his adversaries bring against him. So confident is he of his innocency, that he would bear his accusation openly in the sight of men, (verse 36,) and would not seek to cover his transgression as Adam (verse 33), or to hide his iniquity in his bosom.

H. D.

[To be continued.]

PANTHEISM.—I. PANTHEISM IN GENERAL.

BY J. W. JACKSON.

THERE is no question that we live in an age of unsettled beliefs. From a great variety of causes the minds of men, for some generations past, have been kept in a state of feverish unrest on the very fundamentals of religion, government, philosophy and morals. We have lost, or are in the process of losing, our old certitudes. Men's convictions are not so strong, we fear their faith is not so sustaining, as they once were. We may lament over this, but there is no denying the fact. It is patent to all who know the profounder currents of thought either in our higher literature or in the more informed circles of society. And what renders this characteristic of the age of more serious moment is, that it is not a suddenly developed or exceptional phenomenon, standing out of all due relationship to its antecedents. On the contrary, it is obviously part of a great movement, now apparently culminating, and perhaps about to produce its most momentous results.

This movement is of somewhat ancient date. It commenced with the break-up of "the ages of faith," as they are termed by the Catholic Church. It extends at least as far back as the fourteenth century. Its first manifestation was in that insurrection against the authority of the Church of Rome which eventuated in the Reformation. Its second phase of development resulted in the inauguration of inductive science on the ruins of the *à priori* and Aristotelian philosophy. At its third stage it advanced to the political sphere, and produced the wars of the Commonwealth, the revolution of 1688, and the French Revolution. It was regnant in the eighteenth century, and he would be a bold or a blind man who should assert that it is not very potent in the nineteenth. It has been produced by the reawakening of intellect. At its normal stage it consists in an affirmation of the claims of reason, "the right of private judgment." At its abnormal or exaggerated stage, it ultimates in the dethronement of faith and the enthronement of reason, or, in other words, in the subordination of the moral to the intellectual nature. In the opinion of some persons, it has already arrived at this stage, and we are certainly quite justified in the assertion that it is aiming at and approaching it.

There are tides in the mental as well as the material ocean. It is doubtful if being can exist in absolute rest. And it is quite certain that the more life, the more motion. The oscil-

lations of opinion are healthful and invigorating, even in their extremes. The waters of thought are better for being occasionally troubled. The air is always purer and more bracing after a storm. We have no fear as to the ultimate result of the present conflict, well knowing that only the chaff of error can ever perish.

A movement such as that which we have just described, extending over so many centuries, and those too centuries of rapid progression, could not fail to assume many phases. Thus under its religious aspect, it was mystic and monastic in the fourteenth and fifteenth century, Protestant in the sixteenth and seventeenth, and atheistic in the eighteenth, when it reached the radius of unbelief, and humanity attained to the aphelion of its eccentric orbit. We are now in the process of return, and accordingly it has assumed the phase of Pantheism with the advance of the nineteenth century. The gross, old-fashioned, materialistic, mechanical atheism of Baron d'Holbach, that regarded the universe as a machine, a laboratory, or a kitchen, is now quite superannuated. Only the basest minds entertain it. Only the lowest periodicals advocate it in their columns. It is gone to "the tomb of all the Capulets." But Pantheism is the young and beautiful phoenix that has arisen from its ashes. It is embodied in most respectable octavos, written by authors of repute, and published by firms of undoubted credit. It pervades our science, it is moulding our philosophy, and, we may add, infecting our theology. It is the dominant spirit of the age, and with its subtle influence shapes the thoughts, even of those least conscious of its presence. A few additional remarks then on this peculiar phase of religious belief, or shall we say unbelief, will not perhaps be here altogether misplaced.

Pantheism is of very remote lineage. Brahminism and Buddhism are little other than its formal developments. It underlies both classic and Scandinavian mythology, and its reappearance in modern Germany is simply a manifestation of the racial tendency of an Indo-Germanic people. Perhaps this remark requires some little explanation. There is no doubt that among other orderly arrangements of God's providence, the missions of races as well as individuals find a place. It is patent that the Greek was devoted to literature and art, the Roman to government and legislation, the Phœnician to commerce, and the Jew to theology. These, however, are instances of what may be called *national* missions. We may mount still higher, and take an expansive view of human affairs, in their relationship to the unfolding of what has been not inaptly termed "the drama of history and civilization." In contemplating the

grander divisions of mankind, we find, primarily, that great trinity of races, the Negroid, the Mongolic, and the Caucasian, each of these being subdivisible into a lower and a higher. Thus in the first we have the Negro proper, say of the Guinea coast and the Congo, and his congeners, the Foulah and Caffre. In the second we have the Mongol proper and the Tartar. While in the third we find the Indo-European peoples and the Semites, the former especially developed in the intellectual, and the latter in the moral elements of our common nature. The former have shone especially in philosophy, literature, science, and art, and if asked to point out their especially representative type, we would name the Greeks. The latter have manifested their power in the sphere of religion, of which they have been the great founders and apostles, so that their creeds now prevail, without a rival, from the Indus to the Thames. Their representative type is the Palestinian Jew, though the Arab must not be forgotten.

Now it will be readily understood that if there be any truth in this idea of the missions of races, each one performs that duty best to which it has an especial vocation, and for which it is presumably endowed, with either the requisite organic aptitudes or the appropriate intellectual proclivities. We do not expect the Israelites to excel in metaphysics or statuary, nor do we demand prophetic annunciation from the Hellenes. Plato and Praxiteles undertake the former duties, Moses and Isaiah discharge the latter. We take our philosophy from the first and our religion from the last; and even humanly speaking, it is best that it should be so, for we thus obtain the benefit of that division of labour, of that specialization of function, which ever characterizes the most advanced states of society and the highest types of organization. Now it need scarcely be said that the religious product of the Semitic mind is Monotheism, the underlying element of Judaism, Christianity, and the faith of Islam. While conversely, the religious product of the Indo-European mind is Pantheism. The latter sees the divine *in* Nature. The former beholds the divine *above* Nature. The first adores Creation, the last worships the Creator. The one stops at effects, the other mounts to their cause. The former is guided by reason, the latter by inspiration. The religion of the one is evolved out of the intellect, that of the other originates in the moral sentiments. Strictly speaking, the product of the first is a *philosophy*, while that of the last is alone really entitled to the epithet of FAITH.

It must not be supposed, from the severity of these remarks, that we are blind to the merits or deaf to the claims of Pan-

theism. It has its own place in the universal scheme of things. It makes loud and eloquent proclamation of a truth but too often forgotten both by the Semites themselves, and by exclusive students of the Semitic records, namely, the divine character, and, if we may so speak, the celestial quality of Nature, as the immediate product of a divine Creator, and so the direct expression of his will, and the distinct reflection of his thought. Except in the earlier chapters of Genesis, in the Book of Job, and in some of the Psalms, this sublime truth is scarcely alluded to throughout the Old Testament, but it receives the grandest of all proclamations in the New, in the cardinal fact of the Incarnation. God manifest in the flesh is Pantheism at its culmination. The divine-human is the highest form in which the Creator reveals himself through his creation—thus rendered perennially sacred and everlastingly holy. But it will be observed that this is Pantheism not dis severed from the higher truth of Theism: it is an admission of the celestial quality of Nature, as the bride divine of her omnipotent Lord and Creator. It is an admission of her royalty, as *derivative* from the relation she holds to the Great King. While Pantheism pure proclaims this royalty, this divinity, as *inherent*, and consequently by implication, nay, in unavoidable logical sequence, it proceeds to dethrone and disown the KING, that it may enthrone and worship the *Queen* in his place. The defect of Pantheism then is easily defined,—it is the truth, but it is not the *whole* truth. And in its partial and imperfect utterance of the eternal veracities, let us distinctly understand, that it proclaims the lower to the neglect of the higher, and so in *effect* renders its oracular response to man's deeper questionings a misleading LIE.

The great logical defect of Pantheism (we are of course speaking of Pantheism "pure and dis severed") is that it predicates an *effect* higher than its supposed *cause*. Having merged God in creation, his personality and self-consciousness disappear, and his *will* is resolved simply into *law*. And yet even in our own small province of creation, in this terrestrial sphere, we find personality and will—in ourselves. The Pantheist, poor fellow, is greater than his God, as, in truth, all idolators really are, for man is *essentially* divine, in virtue of his *spiritual* sonship to the Infinite.

Of all the manifold phases of Pantheism, for it has many in its successive stages of *descent*, the most vulgar and grovelling is that with which we are cotemporary, namely, its *scientific* phase, as the pure and unadulterated worship of *material* nature. It is doubtful if humanity, since it emerged out of Fetish worship, ever indulged in a lower form of worship, or bowed in adoration

to a meaner divinity. A God without will or consciousness, that can neither act or be acted upon, save as a piece of dead mechanism! Why, of all the conceptions that ever entered a human mind in relation to the divine, this is the basest. The licentious gods of Greece, and the profligate divinities of Syria, were at least *human*. But this most worshipful *Divus* is not even *bestial*,—it is, as we have said, simply mechanical. Verily, the sacred Bull of Egypt, even had there been no mystic Apis behind its bare animality, would have been a nobler object of worship than this THING—of wheels, and pulleys, and levers, —of attractions, repulsions, and affinities,—of decomposition and recomposition,—this bundle of blind and helpless phenomena that we term nature—without her God.

The metaphysical defect of this phase of Pantheism is its assumption of the independent existence of matter. It thus begins by taking for granted, without proof, its own solution of one of the subtlest problems in moral philosophy. It treads the adamantine pavements of the material universe, and talks in childish confidence of their everlasting because self-subsistent duration, apparently without the shadow of a suspicion, that they may, nay, that they are and must be “such stuff as dreams are made of,” unsubstantial as “the fabric of a vision,” destined some day to “leave not a wrack behind.” That what we call matter is simply *force*, in certain relationship to a precipient mind, of which phenomena are the sensational experience, never apparently occurs to these profound sages. Utterly lost, like the vulgar herd, in the objective, they have not the modesty of the latter, to allow others to speak of the subjective, but with presumptuous ignorance, proceed to dogmatize on *being*, while in truth absolved wholly in *seeming*.

Such a phase of Pantheism as that which we have just been describing, could only exist in a thoroughly material age, and among men habitually engrossed by purely physical phenomena. For thinkers of a nobler order there is a higher phase, which we may term spiritual Pantheism, that contemplates God as the universal spirit, of whom individual minds are the special manifestation. According to this theory, individuals are simply the organs of the “over-soul,” through whom it flows out into appreciable thought and presentable action, and by whose instrumentality, therefore, it discharges all its higher functions. In its essential character this phase of belief is nearly identical with material Pantheism. Under both the Creator is merged in his creation, the one is lost in the many, unity is absolved in multiplicity, and the circumference is presented devoid of its centre. It is simply the opposite pole of Monotheism, the result of con-

templating mind through reason alone to the exclusion of faith. Racially speaking, it is produced by the same preponderance of the intellectual faculties over the moral sentiments, as its material correlate. Spiritual Pantheism is the faith of Indo-European metaphysicians, as material Pantheism is the creed of physicists of the same ethnic type. Both are the result of an endeavour on the part of the Indo-European mind, to liberate itself from the pressure of Semitic influence, and return to the normal creed of the race, that is, the intellectual worship of nature.

Now, again, do not let it be supposed from the severity of these remarks that we are blind to the sublime veracities which spiritual Pantheism embodies. It is quite true that every individual mind is the organ of the universal, as true as that every blossom is an integral part of the tree on which it grows. It is quite true that the infinite spirit is present in the consciousness of all his children. They are the planets of which he is the sun, and the very perfection of their being consists in their *oneness* with him. But then let it never be forgotten that there is the FATHER as well as the children, the sun as well as the planets, and that he is the ORIGINAL of which they are the COPIES. Spiritual like material Pantheism, falls from being only a *half* truth. It is true as far as it goes, but the sublimer part of the journey lies beyond it. It does not attain to the central truth, but only to that which is circumferential and dependent. It does not mount to the *causal* sphere, being detained in a lower region by an unbounded and idolatrous admiration of mere effects.

Now it will be readily understood, from what has been already said, that Pantheism is dangerous from many causes. It is so in the first place from the amount of truth which it embodies, truth not adequately represented in any other system. Perhaps, however, it is scarcely just to say of anything that it is dangerous from the truth which it embodies, for it is this truth which keeps it alive, it is for the proclamation of this that it is permitted to exist. This is its providential mission in the world. Pantheism, however, is yet more dangerous from its adaptation to the racial proclivities of the Indo-European type. It is a system in strict accordance with the preponderating power of their intellectual faculties, and with the comparatively imperfect development of some of their moral sentiments. And it is yet more dangerous from being in harmony with the spirit of the age in its scientific contemplation of nature, to which Pantheism is the religious response. We are then by no means astonished at its prevalence, but neither are we alarmed. It is

simply a passing phase of scepticism—the scepticism of the nineteenth in place of that of the eighteenth century.

We have said that we have no fear of Pantheism, by which we mean, no fear of its ultimate triumph. It can never finally supersede Monotheism, which is the higher and nobler idea of the two. As the creed of the intellect, it is rooted in the wrong province of our nature, for the true seat of religion is in the moral sentiments. As a reaction against the Manicheism of the Churches it is useful, and has its historical place in the gradual development of Christendom. As an evolution out of materialistic Atheism it is a decided improvement, and an unmistakable sign of progress in the sceptical mind of modern Europe. But as a satisfactory solution of the great mystery of being, or as a religion capable of fully responding to the heart-yearnings and spiritual aspirations of the higher class of deeply and earnestly devotional minds, it is and must be an utter failure. As a solution it is deficient. As a personal experience it is wanting. Historically, it has always ended in Polytheism, as in India and Greece. It does so because it is far too subtle and evanescent for the popular intelligence. It escapes the grasp of the masses. As we have said, it is a philosophy, not a religion, and so can only be accepted by a few specially prepared minds, in whom intellectual culture has dominated both the affections and the principles, and in whom, consequently, the emotional portion of our nature has been unduly dwarfed. It is then simply a phase of philosophic culture, the appropriate characteristic of a transitional age like our own, but it is utterly devoid of those enduring elements which could give it a permanent hold upon the human mind. The orphaned soul craves for the love and protection of a spiritual Father. Pantheism has no such divine parent, who is patient and long-suffering, ever prompt to hear our applications, and ever ready to respond to our distresses; it has, we say, no such divine parent to reveal, and so sets up in his place a cold abstraction of law and order, or at the best, of intelligence and beauty. It gives us a faultless statue when we want a living God. It appeals to the head when we require a response to the heart. Of such then, we repeat it, we have no fear. It will die out, leaving neither the ruins of a temple nor the wrecks of a creed, but only a name in philosophy.

[To be continued.]

THEORY OF INSPIRATION DRAWN FROM SCRIPTURE.

IN drawing from Scripture the theory which in a variety of ways it gives of its own inspiration, it is scarcely necessary to say that we mean by Scripture the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, as they were received in the early Church, and are now received in the reformed churches of Christendom. The criticism of modern times has no doubt shewn that here and there passages have been introduced which were not in the original text, or passages which have been altered from their original construction. Allowance must of course be made for such, but we believe that they will not affect our present argument in any degree.

Taking a broad and general view of this question, there can be no doubt that Scripture claims inspiration for itself, not in part, but in whole. Of all that is called Scripture, from an entire book to a verse or a word, it affirms alike this lofty claim. To form any portion, be it large or small, of a particular class of writings, is with it to form a part of Scripture, and to form a part of Scripture is according to it to have been written by inspiration of God. It makes no distinction between any of its parts or any of its writers. Whatever be the subject—whatever be the dispensation—whatever be the age, makes with it no difference whatsoever. So little stress does it lay upon the individuality of its writers, that in large and important parts of Scripture it does not mention, but leaves in complete obscurity who they were. To be a part of a certain series of compositions is with it all in all. Everything, whether historical or devotional, or doctrinal or prophetic, contained within this series is Scripture, and therefore inspired. Such is the general view which beyond any question Scripture gives of itself.

Such is the view which the Old Testament takes of the portions of it already in existence. It is all of it "*the law of the Lord,*" "*the testimony of the Lord,*" "*the statutes of the Lord,*" "*the word of the Lord.*" The book of the law which in Moses had its human author, was also "*God's word,*" to which king and prophet, and prince and people, were to humble themselves; it was "*the law of the Lord by Moses*" (2 Chron. xxiv. 14, 27). As it was regarded in the days of Josiah, so it was regarded in the days of Ezra; it is "*the book of the law of Moses which God had commanded to Israel*" (Neh. viii. 1). When the Old Testament was completed as we now have it, it is in this light that it is regarded in the Scriptures of the New. The highest of all authorities that ever appeared upon the earth, and who is set forth as the Only Son of God come direct from the Father

to communicate the full revelation of his will, is represented in the New Testament as declaring that jot or tittle should not pass from the law till all were fulfilled; that of that book which then contained the Law and Prophets and Psalms, so much as one word could not be broken (Matt. v. 17, 18; John x. 34, 35). If any term might have been supposed to give a higher idea of authority to the Jews than another, it was "The Law," and this expression is used by Christ when he is speaking of the writings of the prophets and of the Psalms. His teaching of all alike was that its every part was "The Scripture," "The Law," which was and must needs be true not in its great outline only, or general teaching, but in its minutest teaching and its individual words. With him, whether as regulating his own conduct or that of others, whether as teaching the weightier matters or those of mint and anise and cummin, "*it is written*" was conclusive and incontrovertible. Such is the authority which, according to the Evangelists, Christ ascribes to the entire series of the Old Testament Scriptures.

In the same way as the Gospels represent Christ as regarding the Scriptures, the Book of Acts represents those, whom it brings before us as inspired teachers, as regarding them likewise. Is a prophecy referred to? "It must needs have been fulfilled" when its time had come (i. 16). Has a prophet spoken? It is God who saith (ii. 16). Are the whole series of prophets alluded to? God hath spoken by the mouths of every one of them (iii. 21). Are the historical parts of the Old Testament brought into notice? They are in the very minutest particular advanced as indisputable facts (vii.; xiii. 17). Is the entire collection of Old Testament writings spoken of? All things that are written in it are believed with the unhesitating faith of heart and soul (xxiv. 14).

In the same manner the Epistles of the New Testament invariably refer to the older Scriptures. From every book of the entire series passages are quoted in a manner that indicates that in the writer's opinion their decision is conclusive. Doctrines of the gravest moment, affecting the condition of every individual of the human race, are supposed to be established by the mere shewing that so "*it is written*" in one or more of their passages (Rom. iii. 9, 10). Of everything, great or little, doctrinal or historical, that is contained in the entire of the ancient Scriptures, it is affirmed that it was written with a view to the instruction of remote ages, requiring a prescience that none but God could have (Rom. xv. 4). Of all that was called "Scripture" in the apostolic days it is asserted or implied, according as we translate the passage, that it was given by inspiration, and was

on this account, and for this reason, profitable to all men for all times (2 Tim. iii. 16). The long series of men called "prophets," who composed so large a portion of the Old Testament, are asserted to have had within them "the Spirit of Christ" (1 Pet. i. 11).

We need not dwell long on the proof that the New Testament regards its own various parts as of equal authority and equal inspiration with the Old. Its Gospels represent Christ as expressly promising that he would for his dispensation send forth an order of men such as God had sent forth in the Old Testament; men "in whom the Spirit of his Father should speak" (Matt. x. 20). The Book of Acts records as its great opening fact the accomplishment of this promise on the day of Pentecost, in a manner and to a degree which had been predicted indeed, but never exemplified in the older dispensation (Acts ii. 16). The Apostles and other inspired men claim for themselves, and for each other, this promised inspiration, as well in their writings as their speeches. Side by side they place quotations from the Old Testament and the New as of the same authority (1 Tim. v. 18). For their directions in writings they claim the acknowledgment on the part of the churches that they are "the commandments of the Lord" (2 Cor. xiv. 37). The words spoken before by the holy prophets of the ancient dispensation, and the commandments of the Apostles of Christ, by word or by letter, are commended to the wide-spread churches as equally worthy of their remembrance (2 Pet. iii. 2). And the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who wrote as well as laboured more than all the other Apostles, is in especial singled out by his great brother Apostle of the circumcision, as having been given by his Master the promised wisdom, which placed the entire series of his epistles on a level with those sacred books which the people of God called "The Scriptures," and as now and henceforth to be reckoned among their number (2 Pet. iii. 16). We thus see that the New Testament writings, as well as the old, are reckoned in the New Testament as "*The Scriptures*," i. e., as books, all of which, from first to last, are reckoned as inspired; all whose statements are to be received by the Church as the words of God himself. Such is their teaching, by direct and positive assertion; by repeated and evident implication; while not one word can be shewn in them opposed to that which they thus teach by inference and assertion.

We can thus form no other opinion of the inspiration of Scripture from Scripture itself than that it is *throughout an inspired record*. It does not permit us to give any superiority in this respect to one part over another. It does not sanction

the idea that it is an inspired record of some subjects but not of others. It does not allow us to suppose that we are to rely implicitly on it in greater matters, but to doubt or reject it on lesser. It includes *all alike* in that lofty claim which it puts forward for itself as the infallible Word of God. "It is written" embraces its jot and tittle as well as its weightier matters—its single words—the number of its nouns—the tenses of its verbs—as much as whole sentences or entire books. For its description of a candlestick—for its account of the furniture of a tabernacle—for its copying of a genealogical table—it claims to be the same inspired testimony, as where it places on record the prediction of a prophet or the enunciation of an apostle. Each and every statement is inspired; is equally inspired according to its teaching.

But from the record itself we come to the *things which it records*. It records a great variety of words, and a great variety of actions. And here we must, according to Scripture, make a very wide distinction between the record and the thing recorded. The former is uniform, the latter presents to us every variety, every shade of truth and error, from the oracles of God himself to the lies of the devil, every pattern of good and evil, from the perfect pattern of Christ's holy life to the foulest actions of the most degraded men. The record of all of those is an inspired record; but the words recorded are no more all-inspired than the actions recorded are all pure and worthy of imitation.

And here Scripture itself affords us a correct and accurate view of the plan and principle on which it was written by that prescient Spirit who throughout guided the record. "Whatever things were written aforetime were written for our learning," is its description of the plan which the Divine Author had in view when He inspired the sacred penmen of the Old Testament (Rom. xv. 4.) These latter may not have had on all occasions, or, for our argument's sake, on any occasion, such an object in view; but the Spirit which was in them had. The same description which is given in Scripture of the plan on which the Old Testament was composed is to be given of the New. An Evangelist may have had for his object, the instruction of an individual, believer, or an apostle, the correction of the errors whether of doctrine or of life of a particular church; but the spirit who was in all the sacred penmen of the New Testament kept in view the edification of ages who should be living when the individuals and churches of the apostolic times had long been among the dead. This providence of the Spirit controlled and guided the record of the words and deeds mentioned in the Bible, and accordingly we have in it *avowedly*

every variety of truth and falsehood. This variety is useful for us. The Bible would not be the Book of the Church if it contained nothing but God's words, or the words of men speaking by His inspiration. We have these, and these form the principal part of Scripture; but we have more, and we want more. We must in an evil and weak world know evil and weakness as well as goodness and uprightness. And so we have evil and weakness depicted in the Bible with a truth and an accuracy nowhere else seen. We have the sayings of men who never received any inspiration, as well as of those who did. We have the sayings of these latter at times when they were not inspired and might have been mistaken, as well as when they were inspired and could not. We have not only God's mind towards His Church, but we have the believer's mind towards God in its strength and its weakness. We have the great wise loving heart of God, painted as only His Spirit could paint it, and we have the heart that is like our own heart—the human heart—painted in all that wonderful complexity and variety which shew alternately the hues of divinity and humanity, of the devil and the beast. The "Thou shalt not surely die" of Satan is just as much a part of Scripture as the "Thou shalt die" of God. Peter's lying denial of his Master is as much a part of the record as his true account of the power and coming of Christ. Paul's narration of advice which he gave on subjects whereon God did not vouchsafe him the gift of inspiration is as much a part of the Scriptures as his authoritative communications to the Churches. All this variety was of use when it was written, and for after times; and so we have it in the Bible. It is enough for us, if that inspired Word affords us indications by which we can distinguish what it puts forward as true, what as false, what as merely human thought to be accepted in whole or in part, or altogether set aside.

We will in the remainder of this paper proceed to give a rapid sketch of the Scriptural theory of inspiration in its various parts and offices, whether as regards the matter to which it relates, or the language in which it relates them, or as affecting the various faculties of those human instruments by whom and with whom it harmoniously works to produce the wonderful and perfect result which we have in Holy Scripture. We purpose in a few succeeding papers to refer more at large to some of these which, from their peculiar difficulty or importance, may appear to require a fuller consideration.

Scripture, in the first place, claims to place before us the various matters it relates with the exact degree of accuracy and fulness which it deems requisite, so that we are to accept its

matter precisely as it presents it. Sometimes it gives its subject matter with the utmost attention to the minuteness and fulness of its detail. Circumstances which to us, now at least, may seem unimportant, are described with a copiousness which leaves no part without its expression, like those paintings which bestow an equal attention on the principal figures and every petty circumstance connected with them. And this minute accuracy is, as the occasion requires it, extended to place and time. The spot at which an occurrence took place, the year or the hour in which it happened, these and the like things are a feature of the way in which Scripture lays its subject matter before us. But it by no means always aims at or claims such an accuracy. Substantial truth is all it frequently professes to give. It relates actions in such a manner as may leave us in doubt whether they were performed by a deputy or the principal party. It in different places relates the sayings of its speakers in a way in which, while the sentiment is similar, the expression is different. It occasionally relates the events of a particular occurrence out of their real order of time. It describes important events, but leaves us in utter uncertainty as to where they occurred. It gives numbers with the avowal that they are not exact, but only an approximation to the precise sum. It speaks of the time when an event took place avowedly without any attempt at exact precision. In place of the minute accuracy which it displays on some occasions, it passes over matters upon others with a condensed brevity of allusion or paucity of circumstance which necessarily subjects the narrative to the obscurity which attends on great abridgement.

When we say that Scripture claims to place the various matters it relates before us so that we are unhesitatingly to accept its account of them, this is equivalent to saying that it claims inspiration for its language, by which alone such expression is or can be given. It does accordingly claim such inspiration in the fullest extent both for the words which those whom it represents as having been inspired spoke under inspiration, and for the language in which it records what they uttered, or what any of its actors either spoke or did. The words of the prophets and of all to whom God made revelation for the purpose of communicating it, are ever described as what God saith, as the Spirit of God speaking by their mouths. While elsewhere, as we shall see, it allows to the human speaker his proper individuality, yet when his part is put in contrast with God's part it affirms that it is not he which speaks, but the Spirit of his Father which speaks in him. While such is the unhesitating credit which it attaches to every word of the record itself, that

arguments of the gravest nature are based on the number of a noun, or the tense of a verb. It does not suppose that the inspiration which is granted to a man when speaking, is withdrawn from him when he sits down to record his words, but calls them alike God's words, when they first flowed in living power from his lips, and when they were by him committed to writing. While over every statement of the entire Scriptures, whether the statement relate to words inspired or uninspired, or to whatever it relates, it throws the same lofty claim of its being a part of the inspired Word of God.

While it makes this high claim for its language, it just as freely and as fully admits it to be human language, and consequently to be judged and interpreted as the language of any other book. In no other terms, indeed, could man be taught, than in human terms; and the language of a divine revelation must needs be human as fully and thoroughly as that which makes no such claim. Scripture, accordingly, admits and assumes this throughout. Its various words are the words of Moses, or Samuel, or Isaiah, or John, or Paul, just as they are also the words of God. That which we should be compelled to admit from the examination of Scripture, which exhibits the various dialects and styles, the various differences from elegance of diction to rudeness, or even barbarism, of different human writers, Scripture does not for a moment, or in a single passage, pretend to deny. Without attempting to account, or seeming to think it at all needful to account, how the same words could properly be God's words and those of a human speaker or writer, it assumes and asserts such to be a fact; and in the very same way that it says that the Spirit spake by the inspired man, it says that the inspired man spake by the Spirit. As the player takes an instrument and breathes through it his own soul of music, while yet in turn the nature of the instrument essentially affects and determines the music of the player, so the Scripture assumes that the Spirit speaks through man, while man determines, to a certain extent, the character of the speech. Inspiration is allowed not to alter the character or style of human language: that which was rude before inspiration is admitted to continue after it. So far from annihilating the human part, Scripture represents the human agent as using, and directed to use, all his natural faculties to work in unison with God's Spirit; and he to whom the divine inspiration is given yet uses his own reason and judgment to seek acceptable expression, language which in his estimation may most influence his readers or his hearers.

This human language, moreover, of the inspired speakers and writers of Scripture, is language addressed to the popular

car. Among the writers of Scripture there are some who stood foremost in rank in their day in the various branches of science then cultivated, but these make as little effort to address a particular class as others who were their inferiors in science. The law of Moses, who was himself learned in all the secret wisdom of Egypt; and who yet wrote for all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the stranger that dwelt among them, was the pattern on which avowedly all Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, was composed. Moses and Solomon addressed the very same audience as the herdsman of Tekoah or the fisherman of Galilee. The language of Scripture was, therefore, and must be essentially and throughout popular, as opposed to scientific language. No matter what were the attainments in any science of any of its writers, it is not in the language of science, but in that of every-day life, that he would address his readers. This is a language which describes things as they appear, not as they are. Frequently popular and scientific language agree, viz., when the appearances of things coincide with their reality, but when they differ, popular language follows the appearances of things. It has a truth of its own though not the truth of science, as the painter's landscape has a truth of its own which is not the truth of geometry. This popular language is used in Scripture on all occasions alike, when it speaks of natural objects and when it speaks of revealed doctrines,—when it records the events of history, or draws illustrations from the world around, or gives rules for every day guidance, or rises upon the wings of poetry.

Another feature of inspiration which Scripture clearly and plainly teaches is its strictly limited nature. Its inspired speakers and writers are limited both in the times and the subject of their inspiration. With respect to the times of their inspiration, the Spirit which made them more than human in knowledge did not visit them or rest upon them at all times. It was only on particular occasions when the Spirit Himself saw fit that heavenly influence descended upon them. For this they had to wait sometimes a considerable time. On some occasions they sought for it and it came; at other times they expected it when it made its visitation; and there were times when it came neither expected or sought for. At all other periods these men were as other men. There may have been in their nation and their age contemporaries of greater forethought and greater knowledge than inspired men in their uninspired hours. Their counsels and anticipations were then liable to error as those of other men. As it was in regard of the time, so it was in regard of the subject matter revealed to them. It was also partial and limited. There

were many subjects in heaven and earth on which they were left to themselves as others were, and on which they were utterly or almost wholly ignorant. Nor were these always subjects specially connected with human science, but they were frequently connected, more or less intimately, with subjects on which they actually received inspiration. They only knew and prophesied in part. Their condition, mental or bodily, while in the period of inspiration—the time to which their revelation was pointed—the very meaning of their visions—all these were, when the Inspirer chose, hid from them. On subjects of religious interest and importance they were consulted, but were occasionally enabled to give no higher answer than such as any other man of equal piety and religious knowledge could have given. Their foreknowledge was at times as limited, their judgment as fallible, their memory as fallacious, as though they had never received the illapse of a spirit to whom all futurity is open, and by whom all the past is ever kept in mind.

When their inspiration was thus limited in time and subject, it appears absolutely necessary for the vindication of their authority, and the satisfaction of their disciples, that they should themselves accurately know when and where they were inspired, and when and where they were not. Accordingly, Scripture everywhere teaches that such was the case with them. They had no doubt that what they spake at particular times was the voice of the divine Spirit within them uttering knowledge, but of the meaning of the communication they, even in their moments of inspiration, not infrequently felt their ignorance. They were perfectly aware at what times they were but as other men, and also of the hour and the moment when the word of the Lord came unto them, and of the period during which it remained with them. They were perfectly aware how far divine knowledge was vouchsafed to them as regarded their personal conduct and their religious teaching, and when this supernatural knowledge was withheld. They are able to distinguish between their own most ardent wishes and the strongest convictions of their own unaided judgment, and the heavenly voice which was to quench the human longing and to overrule the human judgment. And the distinction which they were conscious of within their own minds they are represented as communicating to others, so that the Church to be instructed knew of it as well as the teacher who was to instruct.

It would seem impossible that they should possess such a power of distinguishing the heavenly illapse from the personal conception, unless they retained during the moments of inspiration consciousness and self-possession. Such, accordingly, Scrip-

ture represents them to have retained throughout. We see at times the same coolness and utter absence of excitement that would characterize the most self-collected man in his plans and counsels. But to self-possession the absence of excitement is not essential. In moments of peculiar trial or interest the pulse may beat quicker and the mind be powerfully roused from its habitual quietude, and yet the reason and the judgment remain masters of the whole field of thought and of imagination. And, accordingly, Scripture never brings before us any of its inspired men as abandoned by self-possession and self-control. Fear may fall upon the soul at the visions of things of the unseen world; the muscular frame may lose its power, relaxed by supernatural awe; unusual excitement may leave behind it great prostration both of mind and body; but all through the dream or vision or revelation, of whatever kind it be, Scripture ever represents the mind as retaining its natural powers, the eye seeing, the ear hearing, the judgment and reason passing their verdict, the memory storing up what has been seen and heard.

Scripture represents inspiration as exercised upon every subject of human thought which is connected with and subservient to the design of God in making a revelation to men, and also upon every faculty of the mind which is called into exercise by such subjects. It makes known to the inspired mind events and sayings of the contemporaneous period which were unknown from other sources, and in some cases could only be known through this source. The secret counsels of men living at a distance; the secret thoughts of those who in word or look gave no indication of what was passing in their hearts; the actions of men who were beyond the range of natural vision; the words and the works of which others were witnesses, but of which the inspired man was not: such were subjects at times revealed to men by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The events of future time were also revealed in this way with more or less distinctness as seemed fit to God, with or without regard to their chronological sequence as was judged best by Him. The history of the past, as well as the predictions of the future, were also penned beneath the influence of inspiration. Scripture is not careful to distinguish, and in fact does not take any trouble to distinguish, between what may have been known personally to the historian, or gathered by him from others personally acquainted with the facts, or drawn from written uninspired records, or made known directly to the historian by inspiration, being known from no other source. The Scriptures expressly attribute information to all these sources, without attempting to distinguish how much or how little we are to attribute to each,

satisfied with throwing over all alike the warrant that inspiration presided over and influenced the entire record. As the consequence, we have the religious history of mankind laid before us from its very commencement. The setting forth of true doctrine is a very main part of the work of inspiration. In it every inspired person, whether historian or prophet, takes a part. Sometimes this doctrine is inspired by immediate revelation; more frequently it is derived from the development of what had been already made known at some previous time, from the bringing forward and applying of more ancient Scriptures in their true and full application and meaning. Very frequently also inspiration concerns itself with the record of the musings and reflections, the hopes and doubts and fears, of uninspired men upon the great religious problems of our race, whether as connected with natural or revealed religion, and we have thus brought before us a part of the instruction which Scripture was intended to give. At times these are the reflection of the minds of ungodly men; more frequently and far more fully they are the reflection of men under the decided influence of religious truth. The contingent conduct and the actions of men are also often the subject of inspiration. This, which seems one great object for which the heathen oracles were consulted, we find the subject of inspiration very constantly throughout the Old Testament dispensation, sometimes, but more rarely, in the New.

As inspiration is thus represented in Scripture as exercising itself upon the various subjects connected with the revelation of God's mind, of which it is the vehicle, so we there find it represented as affecting the various organs and faculties of the human mind which are exercised upon their corresponding subjects of thought. On the great faculty of memory it is represented as exercising a marked influence. The remembrance of things which were once known, but have since been forgotten, is by it revived: lengthened discourses which it would be impossible for any human memory accurately to recollect it enables them to remember; sayings which at their first utterance were imperfectly understood, or were positively misunderstood, and which, therefore, however brief, are of all things the most liable to be incorrectly represented, inspiration gave the power of repeating as they were uttered. The human judgment is also represented as strengthened and kept from error by inspiration; so that it is enabled to understand and rightly to apply exhortation, consolation, and doctrine, to the circumstances before them. The human imagination which, even in its ordinary exercise, ventures into regions of thought so little known, and sees things which in their new shapes and combinations were before unseen,

under the influence of inspiration takes wider flights into things still more remote from the seen and known, and sees visions which mere man could not see, and which at times, if attempted to be represented, could not be made intelligible to human thought. Courage, both of a physical and moral kind, is also represented as influenced by inspiration, sometimes given in a greater degree to those who had much of it before, sometimes to those who were all but devoid of it previously.

Its perfect self-reliance is manifested through the entire of the Scriptures. In a book which contains narrative of every imaginable kind, natural and above nature, in the ordinary course of human events, and altogether removed from the usual way, the record never betrays one little sign of doubt or hesitation. All that it relates it relates with the most apparent persuasion of its perfect truth. Even when it relates things apparently inconsistent with each other, it does not seek to clear up the inconsistency. It relates the apparently diverging facts or doctrines as both equally true, but leaves alike to its opponents and its friends the question of their reconciliation.

D. A.

Royal Society of Literature.—J. Hogg, Esq., Vice-President, in the chair.—A Coptic Papyrus, in the possession of H. Vaughan, Esq., was exhibited by the Rev. D. Heath. Mr. Goodwin, previous to his leaving England for Shanghai, deciphered and translated the whole of it. The document is of the eighth century. A woman named Cellsthene grants away her child, aged five years, in the following terms:—"I grant my beloved son Mercury unto the holy monastery of the holy father Phœbamon, of Mount Djeme, that he may be a slave thereto in its watering and drawing and everything enjoined upon the inhabitants of the holy monastery, so that the holy monastery may be his owner for ever, and of the labour of his hands, and the hire of his body, whether he be in the monastery or whether he be out of the monastery, according to the command of the superior. And it shall not be lawful for me, nor for any man of mine, nor any man whatsoever who may be of my town, whether great or little, nor to those who rule, or those who shall hereafter rule over us, to bring any action against the holy monastery on account of this same child, nor to establish any claims upon him before the rulers or powers, little or great. Let such an one, in the first place, not profit in anything, but may God bring him to his holy tribunal with me that I may contend with him, and that he may give account at the judgment-seat of God for that which he hath done, for that he hath laid hands to violate this vow and this offering which I have vowed unto God. And let him fall under the great curses of the Scriptures which are in the Deuteronomy of Moses; let him see the kingdom of God opened while he is prevented from entering into it. For this security, therefore, I have established this grant, and have signed it as it is written." At the back of the Papyrus a unique list of the male and female singers in the monastery is given, arranged antiphonally.

TWO VIEWS OF "ECCE HOMO."

I.

THIS work, though anonymous, is undoubtedly one of great theological importance. The views maintained in it have a considerable claim to originality. We own, however, to a prejudice against a writer who proposes to make a revolution in theological thought, but who is lacking in the necessary courage to affix his name to his book. We doubt whether any great revolution in thought has been effected by a writer who will only fight when he is covered by a shield which renders him invisible to his foe. We will endeavour to forget that the book is anonymous, and do our best to give our readers a fair and impartial statement of its contents.

Some of our contemporaries have represented the work as a counterpart of Renan. Having read both authors, we must pronounce the charge utterly void of foundation. It is hardly possible that two books can be more unlike in style, aim, and tendency. Our author tells us that the purpose of his work is to supply an answer to the question, "What was Christ's object in founding the society which is called by his name, and how is it adapted to attain this object?" Our own perusal of the book would lead us to describe it as an examination into the principles of Christian morality, and the means adopted by Christ to make men better. It points out in the clearest light the radical difference between those adopted by our Lord and every other human teacher. He says: "No theological questions whatever are here discussed. Christ, as the creator of modern theology and religion, will make the subject of another volume, which, however, the author does not hope to publish for some time to come."

This resolution we deeply regret. If the author's opinions are immature, we think that he would have done well if he had waited before he published his present volume until they had attained greater completeness. But it is impossible to read the work and not to arrive at the conclusion, that the writer has matured and settled opinions on many important points of Christian theology. If so, for what purpose does he conceal them? All the imperfections in his book may be clearly traced to this concealment as their source. The connection between theology and the great motive powers which act on man's moral nature is of the most intimate description. The desire

^a *Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ.* London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1866.

of the author to give us a minimum of theology (and theological questions he has not been able wholly to avoid) has forced him to invent a term vague and indefinite, and which glides before our eyes as an *ignis fatuus*. He is obliged to designate by one general expression the moral and spiritual forces by which the author of Christianity sought to act on the spiritual and moral nature of man, and to invent for this the un-English term, "The enthusiasm of humanity," an expression which seems to us to be characterized by every conceivable fault adverse to clear thought. It produces in our minds no distinct conception. We are only able to view it as an algebraic x , used for convenience to designate the unknown views of the author on those points of Christian theology which are the spiritual and moral lever to arouse the heart, the conscience, and the spiritual and moral nature of man. In our eyes the publication of this work on Christ, the legislator of his kingdom, while Christ, the creator of theology and religion, is withholden from us, bears an unfortunate analogy to the proceeding of Her Majesty's Government, when they determined to bring forward a franchise bill, while that for the redistribution of seats was reserved for future consideration. Both are parts of the same whole; each mutually affects the other. In the same manner it is impossible adequately to discuss, "Christ, as the founder of Christian morality," without, at the same time, having before us "Christ, the creator of religion," and for this the vague phrase, "The enthusiasm of humanity," is a sorry substitution.

An utterance of the author's in his short preface has alarmed those who think that a few glances at a book is a sufficient qualification for the office of a critic. He speaks of "Accepting those conclusions about Christ, not which Church Doctors or even Apostles have sealed with their authority, but which the facts themselves critically weighed appeared to warrant." This expression seems to have been sufficient in the eyes of many to establish the infidelity of the work as beyond all question. None can regret its existence more than ourselves, for it sounds an alarm which the general contents of the work by no means justify; in the main, the author rigidly follows the narrative of the Gospels, even in passages rejected by the critics as spurious, or esteemed as doubtful. In a few instances he has introduced unauthorized additions to the narrative, the sole authority for which is his own imagination, herein but too faithfully imitating the practice of many orthodox divines.

The work opens with an estimate of the importance of the ministry of John the Baptist. The author assigns him a very high place in the introduction of Christianity. In his person

was revived the prophetic functions and the old inspiration remodelled to suit the advanced stage of civilization. Here occurs the first instance of the author's unauthorized additions to the Evangelical narrative. He describes the Baptist "as having been driven by his restlessness into the desert, where he had to contend for years with thoughts which he could not master." This may have been the case, and where our information is scanty, nothing is easier than to assume ten thousand possibilities as actualities. Such a mode of converting possibility into certainty helps to invest a work with the appearance of containing startling thoughts. But let it always be observed that one possibility of this kind is as good as another. We may be accused of being dreadfully prosaic, but we feel bound to say that for this assumption there is not one atom of evidence beyond the naked assertion of the author. It is quite as mythical as the assertion that William the Conqueror was eight feet high. The author professes to accept conclusions only which facts critically weighed warrant. He should have adhered to his programme, and not have attempted to take out the scantiness of his materials by unlimited drafts on the bank of fancy.

His views of our Lord's temptation contain many original ideas worthy of careful consideration. But here, again, we have to complain of the needless introduction of assumed facts, of which the historical evidence is absolutely nil. He tells us that "in the agitation of mind caused by his baptism, by the Baptist's designation of him as the future prophet, and by these signs, he retired into the wilderness," and that in this solitude he matured his plan of action. Now this is among the possibilities of things, but it seems to us to be placed forward as an historical fact, whilst it is devoid of historical evidence, having been asserted by no Gospel, either canonical or apocryphal. We are compelled to assume that it rests on the testimony of a person who lived upwards of eighteen hundred years after the event—the author of *Euseb. Hom.* We have but little trust in the historical reality of facts, unsupported by the testimony of eye-witnesses. We have great doubts whether the testimony of a writer, who lived a hundred years after an event, is of much historical value. We must, therefore, demur to the testimony of a witness removed at the distance of eighteen centuries from the event, for the existence of which he is the sole authority. But that the author of this work should have been asserted to be a Renan on a minor scale is a striking illustration of the old adage of "Give a dog a bad name, and you had better hang him at once." Renan wholly denies the historical character of the entire miraculous element in the New Testament. Our author

no less distinctly assumes its authority and trustworthiness. He says, "For some of the Evangelical miracles there is a concurrence of evidence which is very great indeed—for example, for the Resurrection; for the appearance of Christ to Paul; for the general fact that Christ was a miraculous healer of disease. The evidence by which these facts are supported cannot be tolerably accounted for by any hypothesis, except that of their being true."

The author considers the narrative of the temptation as in the main an account of facts detailed by Christ to the Apostles. So strongly is he persuaded of the reality of Christ's power of working miracles, that he considers his temptation as consisting chiefly of suggestions arising in our Lord's mind urging him to employ that power for purposes for which it was not imparted to him. The reasons by which the historical reality of the narrative are supported are very striking, and constitute the best refutation of those who maintain its mythic character which we have seen. He shows that it differs wholly from a story such as would have grown out of the popular imagination. "The story of Christ's temptation is as unique as Christ's character." He proves that it will fit no other character than his. For his vindication of the non-mythic character of the narrative we thank him.

The author proceeds to lay down that it was our Lord's design to revive the old theocracy in his own person, but in a spiritualized form, and adapted to suit the wants of modern times. Of this theocracy he proclaimed himself the king. His Kingship formed the corner stone of his mission and preaching. Several of the functions of the former kings he abandoned, but he laid claim to those which were more especially divine. He declared himself to be the supreme legislator, founder, and judge of the new kingdom of God. There are points in these chapters to which we demur, but we feel bound to say that as a whole they are worthy of the most attentive perusal. The chapter on Christ's credentials is a striking one. While the author admits the possibility of exaggerations having crept into the Evangelical narrative, he asserts that the theory which assigns the invention of that narrative, and the miraculous portions of it to a later age would leave Christ as a personage as mythical as Hercules. The author assumes that it is of the essence of Christ's pretensions, not only that he laid claim to miraculous power, but that this claim was founded in reality. His remarks on the mode in which he used that power are both original and striking.

There are many points in the chapter entitled "Christ's winnowing fan," and "Membership in Christ's kingdom," to which we would gladly draw the attention of our readers. The

views taken of our Lord's bearing in reference to the conventional system of the day are very important. The author has some striking remarks on the simplicity of the creed of the original Christian Church. His observations as to the readiness with which professing Christians excuse the most palpable breaches of Christ's law, compared with the merciless rigour with which they enforce the minutest points of their own dogmatism as a ground of Church membership, are well worthy of the attention of the modern Church. Most men, he observes, are aware of the difficulties of a perfect Christian practice, and they readily excuse what are palpable deviations from it. Few men are aware of the difficulties with which a real belief in many dogmas is attended, and those who never think utter a remorseless condemnation of those who are struggling with the difficulties of faith. "We conclude," says he, "that although it is always easy for thoughtless men to be orthodox, yet to grasp with any strong practical apprehension the theology of Christ is a thing as hard as to practise his moral law."

The author propounds what many will consider as rather high views on the subject of baptism, though not exactly in the sense in which High Churchmen entertain them. With him there is no approach to the *opus operatum*. He believes that our Lord insisted on baptism as a *sine qua non*. Our Lord professed to be a king, and to have a veritable kingdom. Baptism was a formal enrolment under his banner, the outward sign of citizenship in his kingdom. He could have no halting, least of all, no patronizing subjects. Refusal of baptism was equivalent to a denial of His kingship.

The author's remarks on the distinctness of the method pursued by Christ, and that employed by the founders of the different philosophic schools, and of their ends and aims, are worthy of all attention. If our limits allowed of it, we would gladly make considerable extracts from this chapter. With Christ authority is everything. With Socrates that place is held by method. The points in which they resemble each other are entirely superficial. The humblest of men is constantly bringing forward the supreme height of his own authority. The philosopher no less carefully merges it. The death of Christ is an essential portion of the Christian scheme. The martyrdom of Socrates is a dramatic incident in his life; but his whole work would have been complete without it. We particularly draw attention to the clear and luminous manner in which the author has shewn that the clearest knowledge of what is right is powerless for good without the adequate motive to enable us to practise it. On this portion of his work we dwell with un-

mingled satisfaction. "Of these two influences—that of reason and that of loving example—which would a wise Reformer reinforce? Christ chose the last. He gathered all men into a common relationship to Himself, and demanded that each should set Him on the pedestal of his heart, giving a lower place to all other objects of worship—to father and mother, to kindred and wife. In him should the loyalty of all hearts centre. He should be their pattern, their authority, their judge," etc. We sincerely hope that in the future work, *Christ, the Creator of Religion*, we shall find the addition, that Christ claimed to be the only motive force adequate to produce the power of holy obedience in man; or, to use apostolic language, that He claimed to be "the power of God and the wisdom of God."

To this remarkable chapter the author has unhappily appended his own version of the story of the woman taken in adultery, which is characterized by every fault to which we have previously referred. He admits its authenticity: had he rejected it, we should not have complained. But accepting it as a portion of an authentic Gospel, we entirely demur to the author's right to introduce into it statements of facts for which his own imagination is the sole authority: "The shame of the deed itself, and the brazen hardihood of the prosecutors; the legality which had no justice, and which did not even pretend to have mercy; the religious malice which could make its advantage out of the fall and ruin and ignominious death of a fellow creature; all this was eagerly and rudely thrust on his mind at once. The effect of it was such as might have been produced in many since, but perhaps in scarcely any man that ever lived before. He was seized with an intolerable sense of shame. . . . In his burning embarrassment and confusion, he stooped down so as to hide his face, and began writing with his finger on the ground." Now we could have fully appreciated the author if he had denied the authenticity of the narrative; but what we have quoted is novel writing. The probable spuriousness of the passage is no reason for the author's decking it off with statements for which there is not the smallest authority, either canonical or apocryphal. We heartily regret that this system of religious romancing is not confined to our author, and that when indulged in for orthodox purposes the practice is viewed as venial. It is the easiest of all things to fill up blanks in historical narratives by invented circumstances. We would remind our friends, whether orthodox or heterodox, who indulge in such practices, of a somewhat similar achievement effected by Dr. Syntax, very celebrated in its day, when by the power of imagination alone he made a landscape out of a post.

From this most unsatisfactory passage we turn with pleasure to the chapters on Christ's legislation. We do not undertake to indorse the whole of them, but we think it no more than justice to say that they abound with deep and profound views. We recognize with peculiar pleasure the clear and distinct perception that the reformer of human nature, unless he intends to be powerless for good, must come to his work armed not merely with a moral code, but with a motive powerful enough to act mightily on the human heart. No orthodox theologian has a clearer perception than our author that "The law is weak through the flesh." The failure of all the previous schools of philosophy to act on this weakness is strikingly shewn. The nature of pleasure as a motive to moral action is well discussed; so is also the broad distinction between the teaching of Christ, and the principles of the Stoic philosophy. We regret that the length of these passages forbids us to quote them. The author's dissection of the nature of Phariseeism and hypocrisy is admirable. We have never read anything on the point equally clear or equally telling. He has shewn distinctly that they are not the vice of one class of religious opinions, but that they are deeply seated in human nature. We have always considered the position taken by our Lord in relation to Phariseeism and hypocrisy as one of the most unique things in the New Testament. It is evident that our Lord viewed characters deeply tainted with them as more hopeless for good than those polluted by sensual vices. We cordially recommend the greater portion of what the author has written on this subject to the careful perusal of our readers. We can quote one or two brief passages only: "He who could make allowance for the publican and the prostitute made no allowance for the Pharisee. If we examine the charges he makes against them, we shall see that in the first place he charges them with downright undisguised vice. We have not the evidence before us which might enable us to verify these accusations. All that can be said is that those who are endeavouring to avoid infinitesimal sins, such as that of eating an egg laid on a festival day, are particularly apt to fall into sins that are gross as a mountain, open, palpable. But it is evident that Christ was not better pleased with their good deeds than their bad ones. Their good deeds had the nature of imposture, i.e., they did not proceed from the motives from which such deeds naturally spring, and from which the public thought them to spring. . . . Thus it was that the legalists were actors in everything, winning the reverence of the multitude by false pretences, imitating inspired men in everything except their inspiration. . . . They liked to hear the sound of

their titles, to exaggerate the distinctions of their dress, to reflect on their superiority to other men, to find that superiority acknowledged, to be greeted reverentially at public places, to recline at the first couch at dinner-parties. The virtues to the cultivation of which in themselves and others they had devoted their lives, refused altogether to be cultivated by the methods they used, and in the void place of their hearts, where morality and sanctity, justice and the love of God should have been, there appeared at last nothing to mark the religious man, nothing, we may suppose, except a little ill-temper (we would correct the little into an "abundance of ill-temper"); a faint (we beg to say "violent") spite against those who held wrong opinions and a weak (strong?) self-important pleasure in detecting heresy." We could recommend the perusal of this chapter to those modern religionists of every party, sect, and denomination, the secret language of whose heart, if not the open assertion of the mouth, is "The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these."

We must in candour pronounce the chapter entitled "The Enthusiasm of Humanity" a failure. This has arisen from the author's unwillingness to discuss the question of the theology of Christ. In place of a clear exposition of the mighty motive force brought by the Gospel to bear on the heart of man, which constitutes it "The power of God unto salvation to every one that believes," he has invented the hybrid expression, "The Enthusiasm of Humanity." Still, however, even this chapter contains a clear recognition of important Christian truths. The author most distinctly recognizes that love cannot be the result of law, and cannot be made to order; but if it is to be excited in the breast of man, it must be generated by the contemplation of a lovely object. He is only able partially to redeem his promise to pass over all theological questions. He is forced to admit that our Lord did demand a trust in Himself, such as was never demanded before by child of man. He even designates this trust by the term faith. By this, what he calls "The Enthusiasm of Humanity" is excited. He admits that the humblest of men habitually preached himself; that he demanded a greater regard from his followers than what they yielded to the most intimate natural relationships; that they felt enthusiasm for His person to that degree that they could truly describe the spiritual life in them as not their own; they did live indeed, but their life was Christ living in them. The author's difficulties and obscurities in this portion of his work arise from the fact, that while he acknowledges our Lord to be man's Master, King, and Judge; while he describes him as the visible centre of the

power of the invisible theocracy, for some reason, at which for the present we can only guess, he declines to answer the question proposed by our Lord, What think ye of Christ?

Amidst much that is excellent in the chapter on the law of resentment, there are one or two points to which we must take decisive objection. "What prevented," says he, "the prospect from being realized? We must answer, Christ Himself prevented it, simply because He would not restrain his anger. He might have remained silent about the Pharisees; He might have avoided meeting with them or talking with them; He might at least have qualified the severity of his reproofs. None of these would he do; He gave His anger way, and drove His enemies to what men call the necessity of destroying Him."

We think that ere this the author himself must have regretted the tone in which this passage is written, for not only does it seem to us ambiguous, and calculated to leave a false impression, but taken in its more obvious sense, to contradict principles which the author has repeatedly laid down. Has he not stated that our Lord had a work to accomplish, and which he accomplished without shrinking from it? Is it not His view that an important portion of that work was to root up every plant which His Heavenly Father had not planted? Prominent among these plants was the spirit and practice of Phariseeism. On the data laid down by the author himself, our Lord could not have restrained His anger. If He had avoided meeting the Pharisees, He would have been unfaithful to His Father's work. Here, if anywhere, was surely the case for the use of "Christ's winnowing fan." The expression that "Christ would not restrain His anger" is a dangerous ambiguity. His awful denunciations proceeded from the depths of self-possession. The author proceeds: "In His profound resentment he never wavered." True, if the feeling in question can be correctly designated resentment. Phariseeism involved a sin which was the highest treason against the kingdom of God. The author himself has admitted that our Lord felt deep compassion for even the state and the sin of the Pharisee. No less objectionable and misleading is the expression that our Lord died without forgiving His enemies. Our author admits that He did forgive "the personal insults and barbarities which were perpetrated on Himself." We will not deny that the prayer on the cross had chiefly in view the soldiers engaged in His execution. It is certainly confined to those who knew not what they did. We do not forget that Peter, in addressing the Jews, said, "I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers;" but we cannot admit that by this language he meant to assert that

the most active and embittered enemies of Christ did not know what they did. The denunciations in Matt. xxiii., and in some of the discourses in John, imply that our Lord regarded the chiefs of the legal party as wilful opponents. It may be that they acted with some ignorance, but with much knowledge. The author has admitted that our Lord forgave personal enemies. What our Lord would not forgive was unrepented sin—that state of the heart and mind which excludes from the kingdom of God. But to mean this, as we presume is the meaning of the author, and to say that our Lord died without forgiving His enemies, is a misnomer: He died with unchangeable aversion towards evil.

The concluding paragraphs of this chapter contain a partial apology for some acts of the deepest religious atrocity which have taken place in ages of ignorance and sin. We fear that here the author has been borrowing from Mr. Carlyle, and not from Jesus Christ: he shall speak for himself, "War, for example, and capital punishment are denounced as unchristian, because they involve circumstances of horror; and when the ardent champions of some great cause have declared that they would persevere, though it should be necessary to lay waste a continent or exterminate a nation, the resolution is stigmatized as shocking and *unchristian* (the italics are the author's, not our's). Shocking it may be, but not, therefore, unchristian. The enthusiasm of humanity does indeed destroy a great deal of hatred, but it creates as much more. Selfish hatred is charmed away, but a not less fiery passion takes its place." This passage we must pronounce utterly inconsistent with several of our author's leading positions. Surely he has laid it down that one of the chief points of our Lord's temptation was to employ force in the establishment of his kingdom. He resisted the temptation. The Jews expected that the Messiah would appear armed with coercive power, and they rejected our Lord for not fulfilling this expectation. The author has confused himself between ideas utterly incongruous. He tells us that, "intellectually considered, wars for religion and capital punishments for religious errors are frightful mistakes." They are so, but they are also deadly sins. He adds, "It was the want of enlightenment, not the want of Christian humanity (does he mean Christian humanity or the enthusiasm of humanity, or what?) which made it possible for men to commit these mistakes." It was the absence of both. Still more astonishing is what follows. We suppose that the author, when he wrote it, had just allowed himself to be overpowered by some tremendous passage of Carlyle, which made him forget the whole of the foregoing chapters. "Those Syrian battle-fields, where so many crusaders

committed their pure souls unto their captain Christ, the image of his death turned into an ensign of battle, the chalice of the last supper giving its name to an army; these things may shock more or less our good sense, but they do not shock, they rather refresh and delight, our humanity." In our opinion they shock both. Surely while writing such a passage as this, its author must have forgotten all which he had previously established. We thought that he had laid it down in the most absolute terms that Christ's royalty rejected the use of all coercive power. What the author means by the humanity which such scenes rather refresh and delight, whether it be the enthusiasm of humanity, or its most corrupt instincts, we are entirely unable to comprehend. But the author goes the length of uttering a partial apology under certain circumstances for even an *auto da fê*. We maintain that *auto da fê*s and the whole class of actions here partially commended are not only the result of intellectual errors, but of moral and spiritual wickedness, and we feel assured that a few hours spent on the rack of the inquisition would convince even the author of this truth. Deeds of this kind come not partially from above, they are wholly from beneath, and our Lord has forbidden his followers to have recourse to them, even if by a single *auto da fê* they could succeed in purging all sin out of his kingdom.

We have pointed out the chief defects of this remarkable work. But because we are sensible that it contains many imperfections, is that a reason why we should close our eyes to its excellencies? Religious partizans seem to have no conscience. For the errors of a work at issue with their favourite dogmas they have the keen sight of the hawk, but for its good points they are stone blind. This has been the case with the writer in the *Quarterly*. We have not imitated him. Of the defects of this work none are more deeply sensible than ourselves, and our regret is the greater because the book contains many important views which would make us all better by practising them. The habit of condemning all that is good because a book contains some things which are bad, we earnestly deprecate. It seems to be the peculiar sin of religious men. If the newspaper reports are correct, an eminent nobleman, the chairman of most of the Evangelical Societies, has denounced this book as having originated in the bad place. To disclose what takes place there, we leave to others who are better acquainted with its secrets than ourselves. But we calmly ask, Is it the effect of earnest religion to narrow the heart, to blind the understanding, and to generate a humility which vaunts that the views held by me form the pavement of the road to heaven; all others

form a railway conducting rapidly and infallibly to hell? Surely the poems of *Aratus* and *Epimenides* contained as much bad doctrine as *Ecce Homo*, and yet St. Paul quoted from them with approbation. We can hardly imagine that the narrowest bigot can suppose that the lawyer whom, in consequence of his clear appreciation of the superiority of moral over the ceremonial law, our Lord pronounced to be not far from the kingdom of heaven, was quite clear on each of the nine hundred and ninety-nine metaphysical dogmas, belief in each of which in the eyes of many, is viewed as a necessary condition of Christianity. If the clear appreciation of the things which are true, honest, lovely, and of good report in Christianity, if the acceptance of our Lord as founder, king, and judge of the Christian Church, if the admission that faith is a cordial surrender of self, and an attachment to Christ's person powerfully overbearing every other feeling of the human heart, if the confession that Christ himself is the Christian's life—that he has supplied the mighty motive which philosophers sought to discover, and sought in vain, if the confession that Christ is the visible king of the invisible theocracy be of the devil, the bad world must surely be getting better. But in these days zealous religionists seem to think that it is the most special duty of the Christian to quench the smoking flax. We will conclude by quoting the last paragraph. "But the achievement of Christ in founding by his single will and power a structure so durable and so universal, is like no other achievement which history records. The masterpieces of the men of action are coarse and common in comparison with it, and the masterpieces of speculation are flimsy and unsubstantial. . . . No architect's design was furnished for the New Jerusalem, no committee drew up rules for the universal commonwealth. . . . The inconceivable work was done in calmness; before the eyes of men it was noiselessly accomplished, attracting little attention. Who can describe that which unites men? Who has entered into the formation of speech which is the symbol of their union? Who can exhaustively describe the origin of civil society? He who can do these things can explain the origin of the Christian Church. For others it must be enough to say, 'The Holy Ghost fell on those who believed.' No man saw the building of the New Jerusalem; the workmen crowded together, the unfinished walls and unpaved streets; no man heard the clink of trowel or pick axe; it descended out of heaven from God." Whatever may be the opinions of this writer, we emphatically say that he ought not to be called an infidel.

R.

II.

THIS is a very remarkable work, and it is manifest that there will be two opinions respecting its deserts. These two opinions will not differ from each other as regards the impression of what the present work is in and by itself, but as regards the impression of what the theological views of the author will turn out to be, when he proceeds to perform his promise of devoting another volume to the consideration of "Christ as the Creator of Modern Theology and Religion." For our own part, we are satisfied with regarding this work in and by itself, and see no reason for dissenting from the almost universal voice that has proclaimed it one of the most extraordinary books of modern days, and certainly one of the most remarkable of those to which the British mind has given birth. With the exception of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, and Butler's *Analogy of Religion*, we think it may safely be designated the most striking and remarkable theological work in the English language. The dry, hard, critical orthodoxy of Pearson on the Creed is not to be mentioned in the same category with it.

We hail its appearance in one respect with the greatest gladness. It has long been our opinion that the Monothelite Heresy has gradually permeated almost the whole of the Western Church and the bodies that have dissented from it, and that the difficulty of conceiving our Lord as a historical character has arisen from the purely Monothelite manner in which His personality has been regarded and presented by theologians. The Monothelites—according to Mosheim's summary of their tenets—"disclaimed all connection with the Eutychians and Monophysites, and confessed that there were in Christ the Saviour *two natures*, so united without mixture or confusion as to constitute but one person. They admitted that the human soul of Christ was endowed with a will, or the faculty of willing and choosing; and that it did not lose this power of willing or choosing in consequence of its union with the divine nature. For they held and taught that Christ was *perfect Man* as well as *perfect God*; and of course that his human soul had the power of willing and choosing. They denied this power of willing and choosing in the human soul of Christ to be inactive or inoperative; on the contrary, they conceded that it operated together with the divine will. They, therefore, in reality admitted *two wills* in Christ, and that both were active and operative wills. Yet they maintained, that in a certain sense there was but *one will* and *one operation* of will in Christ."

Now, could a more exact summary of the doctrine practically

current at the present day, respecting the connection of the Divine and Human Natures of our Lord, be given than in the words of the above description of the Monothelite tenets? Our Lord, it is currently said, suffered in body and mind as Man; as God he worked miracles, confuted the tempter, and knew the thoughts of his enemies. Whence but from the practical influence of these quasi-Monothelite views has the Church of Rome taken so exalted a view of our Lord's Humanity as to find it necessary to remove Him a step further from our sinful race by inventing and imposing the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of His Mother? Whatever may be thought of Bishop Colenso's views as to the authorship and inspiration of the Pentateuch, it was inexpressibly painful to us to see him also condemned for constructive heresy on purely Monothelite grounds, respecting an alleged denial, repudiated by himself, of the divinity of our Lord. It would be just as easy to prove that Bishop Gray and the Dean of Cape Town ought to be Monothelites, or even Docetæ, as they appear to have considered it to prove that Bishop Colenso must needs be a Socinian against his will. But we are getting a little beyond our province, and must not carry this kind of discussion any further; indeed, nothing but a love of fair play has induced us to travel out of the record, to remind certain throwers of stones that they may themselves after all be living in glass-houses of considerable brittleness.

It would seem that the plan of the writer of *Ecce Homo* has been to abstain from all assumption not admitted on the most ordinary historical ground of evidence, and accepting the ground of Renan, Strauss, and others, to meet and conquer them upon it by exhibiting a portraiture of Christ which should be that of a real and living MAN, liable to no such slighting epithets as those of "mythical" and "legendary," which have been so freely and so unjustly bestowed upon the real life and character delineated in the Gospels, but have been with considerable show of reason attached to the unreal Christ of current orthodoxy. In this he has been most successful so far as the Humanity of our Lord is concerned, and if he takes the view that the simple solution of the difficulties is, that the human and divine natures and wills, though throughout united in the same person, were not in communication with each other, until the human nature had done its work and gained its victory, we see no reason to tremble for his volume on the theology of the question.

In discussing the temptation of our Lord (pp. 9—17), our author appears to consider the evidence for the account somewhat deficient, and also to suppose miraculous circumstances to

be involved in it. To our mind he would have managed his argument much better had he stated that the connection of miraculous circumstances with the temptation itself was a disputed point, on which the brevity of the narrative leaves us little hope of obtaining absolute certainty. The account of the death of James the Just makes it pretty certain that the "pinnacle of the temple" was easily accessible, so that really no miraculous circumstances remain of necessity to be accepted, except those antecedent to the temptation. As regards the third temptation, the explanation given by our author is identical with that given by a writer in this Journal two or three years ago.

We are not quite satisfied with the manner in which our author, in page 25, discusses Christ's view of his legal descent from David. It appears to have been that without which he could not have been what he was, τὸ ἀνευ οὗ τοῦ αἵτιον, οὐκ ἂν ἦν ποτ' αἵτιον, although by no means the αἵτιον itself; and as such we believe he both regarded the title of "Son of David" himself and accepted it from others.

The statement in page 45, that our Lord "rigidly abstained in practice from inflicting any kind of damage or harm," ought to have been qualified by the addition of the words "under provocation." For it cannot be denied that the destruction of the Gadarenes' swine must have been a certain "damage or harm" to some member or members of their community.

In pages 79 and 80 there are strong remarks upon the "disfranchised pauper class," who, "overwhelmed with the difficulties which beset their minds and afraid of damnation, suddenly resolve to strive no longer, but, giving their minds a holiday, to rest content with saying that they believe, and acting as if they did." Then follows a passage which strongly reminds us of Tennyson's:—

"Perplex in faith, but pure in deeds,
At last he beat his music out,
There lives more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half the creeds.

"He fought his doubts and gather'd strength,
He would not make his judgment blind,
He faced the spectres of the mind
And laid them : thus he came at length

"To find a stronger Faith his own;
And Power was with him in the night,
Which makes the darkness and the light,
And dwells not in the light alone,

" But in the darkness and the cloud,
 As over Sinai's peaks of old,
 While Israel made their gods of gold,
 Although the trumpet blew so loud."

In page 147 is a striking explanation of the allegory of "the strong man armed." "The strong man armed is the anarchic passions of human nature, against which the lawmaking power contends. Nothing can control them, says Christ, but a stronger passion still. And he goes on to explain that an empty condition of mind, a quiescence or temporary absence of the anarchic passion, is a hollow and dangerous state. The demon may leave his abode for a time, but he finds no sustenance abroad, and so at last back he comes hungry, and brings congenial guests with him."

In the treatment of the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, our author displays marvellous taste and skill. In page 104 we find, "The shame of the deed itself, and the brazen hardness of the prosecutors, the legality that had no justice and did not even pretend to have mercy, the religious malice that could make its advantage out of the fall and ruin and ignominious death of a fellow-creature—all this was eagerly and rudely thrust upon his mind at once. The effect upon him was such as might have been produced upon many since, but perhaps upon scarcely any man that ever lived before. *He was seized with an intolerable sense of shame. He could not meet the eye of the crowd, or of the accusers, and perhaps at that moment least of all of the woman.* Standing as he did in the midst of an eager multitude, that did not in the least appreciate his feelings, he could not escape. In his burning embarrassment and confusion he stooped down so as to hide his face, and began writing with his finger upon the ground. His tormentors continued their clamour, until he raised his head for a moment and said, 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her,' and then instantly returned to his former attitude." How beautifully is the true and perfect humanity of our Lord thus caught, as it were, and depicted by a masterhand!

In pp. 133 and 154 it is said that our Lord seized upon the passion of "the love not of the race, nor of the individual, but of the race in the individual; the love not of all men, nor yet of every man, but of *the man* in every man," and "treating it as the law-making power or root of morality in human nature, trained and developed it into that Christian spirit which received the new name of *ἀγάπη*." In the subsequent chapter on this *ἀγάπη*, which our author converts into the "enthusiasm of

humanity," and perhaps rightly, for both "love" and "charity" are more or less ambiguous terms, we think he scarcely does justice to some of the almost inspired anticipatory utterances of heathen writers on this point. He might well have cited Cicero, *De Legg*, I. 15, 43, where various virtues are said to spring from the fact that "*naturâ propensi sumus ad diligendos homines, quod fundamentum juris est.*"

In pp. 165 and 166 we find very striking and true remarks. "Therefore also the first Christians were enabled to dispense with philosophical phrases, and instead of saying that they loved the ideal of man in man, could simply say and feel that they loved Christ in every man." "Christ believed it possible to bind men to their kind, but on one condition—that they were first bound fast to himself."

In p. 186 we find it stated:—"The sinner whom Christ habitually denounces is he who has done nothing. This character comes repeatedly forward in his parables. It is the Priest and Levite who passed by on the other side. It is Dives, of whom no ill is recorded except that a beggar lay at his gate full of sores, *and yet no man gave unto him.*" It is the servant who hid in a napkin the talent committed to him. *It is the unprofitable servant, who has only done what it was his duty to do.*" Here our author has fallen into the common error of endeavouring to increase his accumulation of evidence by testimony that will not bear examination. It is *not* recorded that "no man gave unto" the beggar who lay full of sores at the rich man's gate. That expression is used of the prodigal son in his distress in a far country, and our author has very carelessly, by a slip of memory, transferred it to the case of Dives and Lazarus. Again, "the unprofitable servant who has only done what is his duty to do," is nowhere held up to reprobation as one of those "who have done nothing." On the contrary, we are *all* bidden, after doing all that has been commanded us—so certain is it that we shall all fall short of the ideal standard of perfection—to say, "We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do."

In p. 203, we find it stated that the "Spirit was expressly given to guide men *unto all truth*," the implication being that many of the physical discoveries of modern times, especially in the way of philanthropy, are the fruits of the Holy Spirit. Now we would never deny that they are so, but we confidently affirm that no promise to that effect was made by Christ. Our author has been misled by the English Authorized Version of John, xvi. 13. The promise is that the Spirit of truth shall lead the disciples *εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, or, as the earliest MSS. have

it, ἐν πάσῃ *ΤΗΙ ἀληθείᾳ*, "into" or "in all *THE* truth;" where *the* truth evidently refers to the truth as regards our Lord's own person and character, and the future position of his disciples in the world, of all which things they had as yet but crude and rude conceptions.

The chapter on the "law of mercy" is a very beautiful one. We give an extract from p. 231:—"Criminality certainly appeared to Christ more odious and detestable than it appeared to his contemporaries. How strange, then, to find him treating it more leniently! Those, it appears, whose moral sense was moderately strong, who hated vice moderately, yet punished it so severely that they utterly excluded those who were deeply infected with it from their society and their sympathy; he who hated it infinitely was, at the same time, the first to regard it as venial, to relent towards it, to parley and make terms with it. He who thought most seriously of the disease held it to be curable, while those who thought less seriously of it pronounced it incurable. Those who loved their race a little made war to the knife against its enemies and oppressors: he who loved it so much as to die for it, made overtures of peace to them. The half-just judge punished the convicted criminal; the thoroughly just judge offered him forgiveness." Then follows a most beautiful reconciliation of justice and mercy.

In p. 267 we have a most valuable series of remarks on our Lord's pronouncing "with unanswerable point and truth—what is true of many other worshippers of antiquity besides the Pharisees—that they were the legitimate representatives of those *who killed the prophets*, and that they betrayed this by the very worship which they paid to their memory. "Let us linger on this for a moment," says our author. "It is trite, that an original man is persecuted in his lifetime and idolized after his death, but it is a less familiar truth that the posthumous idolators are the legitimate representatives of the contemporary persecutors. The glory of the original man is this, that he does not take his virtues and his views of things at second-hand, but draws wisdom fresh from nature and from the inspiration within him. To the majority in every age, that is, to the superficial and the feeble, such originality is alarming, perplexing, fatiguing. They unite to crush the innovator." But it may be that they are eventually compelled to withdraw their opposition and abandon their routine. From the example of the original man they construct a new routine. And then "who are those who idolize his memory? Who are found building his sepulchre? Precisely the same party which resisted his reform; those who are born for routine, and can accommodate themselves to every-

thing but freedom; those who in clinging to the wisdom of the past suppose they love wisdom, but in fact love only the past, and love the past only because they hate the living present; those, in a word, who set Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in opposition to Christ, and appeal to the God of the dead against the God of the living."

In p. 271, we imagine we detect a slip of memory. "Sometimes," says our author, "it was good, the wisdom of Moses or Isaiah, sometimes it was the dotage of a *Shammai*." To the best of our recollection the teaching of *Shammai* was in many respects strikingly in accordance with that of our Lord, while that of *Hillel* might most justly be designated as "dotage." And the quibbling *Hillel*, not the sensible *Shammai*, was the favourite doctor of the builders of the tombs of the prophets.

When the author, in p. 328, states that "some of the men in whom the Christian spirit has been strongest have been among the most miserable of the race," we are at no loss for examples, as, for instance, the poet Cowper; but when he proceeds to tell us, that "some nations have imbibed it deeply, and have not been led by it to happiness and power, but have only been consoled by it in degradation," we are at a loss to imagine *what* nations are intended by him. We have always supposed it an historical fact that a corrupted Christianity has always either preceded or accompanied the degradation of a Christian nation. But the defence of science, as also a revelation from the Almighty, in the course of which this, as it appears to us, erroneous statement occurs, is in many respects very noble.

Let us conclude our criticism with the concluding words of our author himself. "The achievement of Christ, in founding by his single will and power a structure so durable and so universal, is like no other achievement which history records. The masterpieces of the men of action are coarse and common in comparison with it, and the masterpieces of speculation flimsy and unsubstantial. When we speak of it, the common-places of admiration fail us altogether. Shall we speak of the originality of the design, of the skill displayed in the execution? All such terms are inadequate. Originality and contriving skill operated indeed, but, as it were, implicitly. The creative effort which produced that against which, it is said, the gates of hell shall not prevail, cannot be analyzed. No architect's designs were furnished for the New Jerusalem, no committee drew up rules for the universal commonwealth. If in the works of nature we can trace the indications of calculation, of a struggle with difficulties, of precaution, of ingenuity, then in Christ's work it may be that the same indications occur. But these inferior and

secondary powers were not consciously exercised; they were implicitly present in the manifold yet single creative act. The inconceivable work was done in calmness; before the eyes of men it was noiselessly accomplished, attracting little attention. Who can describe that which unites men? Who has entered into the formation of speech which is the symbol of their union? Who can describe exhaustively the origin of civil society? He who can do these things can explain the origin of the Christian Church. For others it must be enough to say, 'the Holy Ghost fell on those that believed.' No man saw the building of the New Jerusalem, the workmen crowded together, the unfinished walls and unpaved streets; no man heard the clink of trowel and pickaxe; it descended *out of heaven from God.*"

W.

P.S.—Since writing the above we have perused a most violent attack upon *Ecce Homo* in the *Quarterly Review*. Such an attack must do more to increase the popularity and circulation of the work than any number of favourable notices.

W.

Spelling of Oriental Names.—In a letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Mr. E. S. Poole says:—"In this year of grace we are actually without a recognized system for writing Arabic, Turkish, or Persian in English characters, and content ourselves with adopting the orthography of our French or German neighbours, whichever may chance to introduce a hitherto unknown word. A notable instance may be cited in the review of Palgrave's *Arabia* in the last *Quarterly*, wherein the various books out of which the article is composed may be traced by the various orthography—Anglo-Indian, German, French, English. Of a writer who knows no more of his subject than the one referred to, this may be expected; but unfortunately better informed men—without special knowledge—are at a loss to learn the correct spelling of words of every-day occurrence. Take the name of the Arabian Prophet. It has passed through every kind of metamorphosis, from the Mahound of the Crusades to the Mehemmet of the Turks (i.e., the Turkish pronunciation), whence the French Mahomet and our Mahomed. Recently an effort has been made to give the prophet his right appellation; and, after many attempts, we have arrived at Mohammed. Will it be possible to teach people that Mohammed signifies "praising," Mohammad "praised," and that this is the true spelling? But my reason for thus writing to you was the letter of the learned secretary of the Palestine Exploration Fund which appeared in the *Times* lately. While the geography and topography of the Holy Land are being carefully investigated, surely a favourable opportunity is presented of determining the correct names of its cities and villages, its mountains and plains. The Oriental words in Mr. Grove's letter are spelt after various fashions, and small blame to him, for such incongruities have received the sanction of nearly all his predecessors. But it is time that a uniform, scholarlike, and intelligible system be adopted for writing all the modern Palestine names—no matter what precisely that system may be—and a great good will be done. I would suggest, however, that we, British Philistines though we be, should follow the example of the French, and construct a system congenial to our language; not like the Germans, whose equivalents for Oriental letters are like the hieroglyphics in which the *Fonetik Neu* used to take delight, and require for their understanding an elaborate interpretation."

**THE ALMANZI COLLECTION OF HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS IN
THE BRITISH MUSEUM.**

THAT the British Museum contained a collection of Hebrew manuscripts by no means contemptible in point either of number or value, must have been known to many of the readers of *The Journal of Sacred Literature*. But very few of them, in all probability, are aware that this collection has, during the last twelve months, been nearly doubled in respect of extent, whilst its intrinsic worth has been enhanced in an almost equal ratio.

Amongst those foreign Jews who, following the example of David Oppenheimer, Hermann Joseph Michael, and Giovanni Bernardo de' Rossi, have devoted a portion of their wealth to the acquisition and preservation of the monuments of their national literature, the name of Giuseppe Almanzi of Padua has long been conspicuous. A merchant by profession, he also attained some eminence as a man of letters, and accumulated a large library of both manuscripts and printed books, chiefly of course connected with Jewish literature. After his death, which took place in 1860, at the age of fifty-nine, his heirs resolved to dispose of his library; and the most important portions of it have now, thanks to the liberality of the Trustees of the British Museum, found, like several similar foreign collections, a home in this country.

A catalogue of the Almanzi manuscripts,—too short, however, to be entirely satisfactory,—has been published by the celebrated Jewish scholar Samuel David Luzzatto, in several successive numbers of the now extinct periodical entitled *הפנקס*, *Hebraeische Bibliographie*, edited by the learned and indefatigable Moritz Steinschneider, who added some useful and interesting bibliographical notes. These descriptions have been republished, in an abridged form, as part of the sale-catalogue of the Almanzi library, preceded by a biography of the late possessor (in Hebrew), also from the pen of his friend Luzzatto. From these materials, and my own tolerably minute examination, the following notice has been drawn up.

Leaving out of account some volumes in Hindī, Latin, and several modern European languages, the Almanzi library, as now deposited in the Department of Manuscripts of the British Museum, consists of upwards of three hundred numbers, which will form, when properly bound, three hundred and twenty-two volumes (Add. 26892—27213). Of these, between fifty and sixty are either on vellum, or on vellum and paper mixed; the remainder are on paper alone.

In regard to age, the reader may perhaps be disappointed when he hears that there is no manuscript among them which can, with safety, be assigned to an earlier period than the thirteenth century. But how many, even Biblical manuscripts, are there in western Europe of much earlier date? In all the public libraries of England, France, Germany, and Italy, there are very few Hebrew manuscripts which date from, or can reasonably be assigned to, so remote a period as the tenth and eleventh centuries;^a and we need not, therefore, be surprised that none of them should have fallen into the hands of even so indefatigable a collector as Almanzi. He possessed, however, at least three dated manuscripts of the thirteenth century; viz., a copy of Solomon Isaakī's commentary on the Pentateuch (*Rashi*),^b A.D. 1273 (Add. 26917);^c a Roman *Machzōr* or Service-book, A.D. 1297 (Add. 26998); and a fine copy on paper of the *Tachkēmōnī* of Jehudah Al-Charizī, A.D. 1282 (Add. 27113). With regard to the Roman Prayer-book, Add. 26957, which is dated A.D. 1270, the scribe has not improbably copied the colophon of the older manuscript that lay before him; for the whole appearance of the volume seems to savour of a later period. And in the case of Add. 27187, which is a copy of the *Tūr Chōshen ham-Mishpāt* of Jacob ben Asher, the date 1260 (שנת עשרים לפרט) is simply absurd, as the author died about A.D. 1340, and the manuscript itself appears to belong to the end of that century or the beginning of the next. On the other hand, there are several undated volumes in the collection, which are evidently of the thirteenth century; such, for example, as Add. 27169, containing the *Midrash Bērēshith Rabbā* and *Vai-yikrā Rabbā*; and the magnificent copy of the *Machzōr Vitry* (Add. 27200-201), of which more hereafter. The number of dated and undated vellum manuscripts of the fourteenth century is naturally greater; and this period is also represented by at least one manuscript on paper, Add. 27197, which was sold by a certain Moses ben David of Jerusalem to Rabbi Shemariah ben Jehudah of Canea in Crete in the year 1406, and is evidently a good many years older.^d

^a The Karaitic manuscripts of the Crimea are the solitary exception of importance; and they all seem, unfortunately, to have found their way to St. Petersburg.

^b רש"י, as I need hardly remind the reader, is an abbreviation of רבי שלמה ישראלי. *Jarchi* (ירחי) is merely a misnomer.

^c In calculating the dates, I have simply added 240 to the Jewish year. There may consequently, in some cases, be a slight error, which will reduce the number of Christian years by one.

^d The reader should be informed that several of the Almanzi manuscripts are quite recent copies, made either by Almanzi himself, or by other persons for him, from volumes which he was, for some reason or other, unable to purchase.

In *Biblical codices* the Almanzi collection is not rich, as it contains only five. The finest of these is a manuscript of the *Latter Prophets* (Isaiah—Malachi) in large folio, fully pointed, with the commentary of David Kimchī (Add. 27046). It was written at Rovigo in Italy, A.D. 1448. Add. 26988 and 27167 are small copies of the Pentateuch, both of the fifteenth century. The latter, which also contains the *Haphtārōth* and the five *Mēgillōth*, is beautifully written and richly ornamented. Add. 27053 is a small-sized volume, imperfect both at the beginning and the end, and rather carelessly pointed, containing the Psalms, Job, Esther, the Song of Songs, the Lamentations, and Ecclesiastes. Lastly, in the small duodecimo Add. 26973, we have the unpointed text of the Psalms.

To make up in some degree for the painful paucity of Biblical codices, the Almanzi library is rich in *ritual* and *liturgical* manuscripts, *Machzōrs*, *Siddūrs*, and the like, chiefly representing the uses of the German and Italian Jews. To this class belong the two gems of the collection, the *Machzōr Vitry* and the illuminated *Haggādāh shel Pesach*.

The *Machzōr Vitry*, or Ritual of the Synagogue of Vitry in France, was compiled about A.D. 1100 by Rabbi Simchah of that town, a disciple of Solomon Isaakī (Rashi). It is a work of great size, comprising not only the daily prayers and those for the Sabbaths and Festivals, with *Ma'aribim*, *Hōsha'nōth*, and other hymns, but also various ceremonial laws and regulations, forms of legal documents, rules regarding the calendar, tables of the lessons, etc.; further, the *Haggādāh* or ritual of the Passover, the *Pirkē Abōth*, with a commentary, the *Perek Rabbī Mēir*, the *Midrash* of the Ten Commandments, with a long introduction, and various other tracts and expositions of Talmudical passages. Of this *Machzōr* only two copies have survived the ravages of time. The one, which is now deposited in the Bodleian library (Oppenheim. 668, folio), is a single volume, said to be dated A.D. 1208. I have not myself seen the book, but have been told that it is imperfect. The other copy, now secured for the British Museum, is bound in two large folios (Add. 27200-201), and seems to be but very slightly defective. It is not so old as the Oxford manuscript, for in one of the forms of legal documents the year of the world 5000 is mentioned (שנת חמשת אלפים וכך וכך), thus shewing that it was written after A.D. 1240. As a fresh illustration of the trite saying "habent sua fata libelli," I may mention that these two volumes were purchased by Almanzi in 1824, along with another manuscript, from the widow of Rabbi Isaac Raphael Finzi of Padua,

for the paltry sum of ten thalers or thirty shillings! Witness his own handwriting on the first leaf of Add. 26939:—

בהנ"א הן קניתי היום ר"ח אייר לשנת או קנה מיד עמ"תך
לפ"ק מאת אלמנת הרב המחבר כמודור"ר יצחק רפאל פינצי
וצוקל"ס הזה עם מחזור ויטרי כ"י ב' חלקים בקלף ונתתי
לה עשרה טא"לירי בכסף מלא : הצ' יוסף אלמנצי.

The manuscript Add. 27210 is highly interesting from more than one point of view. It contains the *Haggādāh shel Pesach*, or Ritual of the Passover, accompanied by *Azhārōth* of Zerahiah ha-Lēvī, and various *Piyūtim* and other liturgical pieces relating to that Feast. The volume is beautifully written and fully pointed, the *Haggādāh* being in large, bold letters, the rest in characters of a smaller size. It is richly decorated throughout with initial words and letters in gold and silver, and with ornamental headings and devices in various colours. But the greatest care has been spent upon a series of fifty-six miniatures at the commencement, representing the principal events of Biblical history, from the creation down to the institution of the Passover, which are executed, according to the opinion of competent judges, in the best style of art. Sir F. Madden—and I can cite no higher authority—has already spoken of this manuscript as being “of peculiar value as illustrative of art,” and has assigned it to the beginning of the fourteenth century. It is, therefore, highly desirable that it should be minutely examined and described by some student of art, who may be fully competent to do justice to its merits. I may add, that this volume was, in all probability, originally intended for a wedding present; and that it was given away on a similar occasion at Carpi, in the Modenese territory, in the year 1603. The last page exhibits the signatures of no less than three of the Roman censors of Jewish books; viz., Fra Luigi da Bologna, February, 1599; Camillo Jaghel, 1613; and Frate Renato da Modena, 1626.

Among the liturgical manuscripts are also deserving of notice Add. 26978, which contains the *Siddūr* of Rab Amram; and Add. 27205, an ancient volume of *Sēlichōth* or penitential hymns. Here too may be mentioned the modern hymnal of Moses ben Michael hak-Kohen, minister of the Levantine Synagogue at Venice (A.D. 1702), entitled *Nē'im Zēmārōth* (Add. 26967); and the *Shē'erith Yisrā'el*, a collection of hymns by Israel Nagāra, or rather Najāra.

Of manuscripts of the *Targūms* the Almanzi library contains

but one (Add. 27081), which is, however, of considerable value. It is a copy of the *Targūm Yērūshalmī*, or Targūm of Jerusalem, on the Pentateuch, written in Germany early in the sixteenth century.

The *Midrashic* writings are better represented by such volumes as Add. 27169, a fine Italian manuscript of the thirteenth century, containing the *Bērēshith Rabbā* and *Vai-yikrā Rabbā*; and Add. 27089, in which we find the Midrash on the Lamentations (*Echāh Rabbāthī*), the *Pēfirath Mōsheh* or Death of Moses, the *Midrash Vai-yissā'ū* (Gen., chap. xxxv. 5), and several other midrashic tracts. The *Dibrē hai-yāmīm shel Mōsheh*, or Chronicles of Moses, are extant in Add. 27113, which was written A.D. 1282, and in Add. 27129. In the latter volume they are united with the book of Eldad the Danite and the Proverbs of Siracides (משלי בן סירא).

Of the various *Biblical commentaries* I may mention the following, as being some of the more important. Add. 26917 is a fine copy of Solomon Isaakī (Rashi) on the Pentateuch, dated A.D. 1273; and Add. 26924 contains the same commentary, along with that on the five *Mēgillōth*. In Add. 26983 we find the commentary of Moses ben Nachman in an abridged form. Of other commentators on the Pentateuch there is Jacob Antoli, or more correctly Anatolio (Add. 26898, the *Malmad hat-Talmūdīm*), Jacob ben Asher (Add. 27084), Levi ben Gershon (Add. 27069), Isaac ben Jehudah hal-Lēvī (Add. 27128, the *עמק דבר* or "Revealer of Secrets"), and Menachem Tsiyonī (Add. 27202). Of David Kimchī we possess the commentary on the Latter Prophets in Add. 27046. For the Psalms we have that of Joseph Chaiyūn ben Abraham in Add. 26902, a book that once belonged to the famous Leo Hebraeus, Don Jehudah Abravanel. Add. 26894 contains the commentary of Moses ben Nachman on the book of Job, and several other works by the same author, the most remarkable of which are the *Tōrath hā-Adām* and the *Cheshbōn Kēts hag-G'ullāh* or "Calculation of the Period of the Messianic Deliverance." Here too I may mention the writings of Jehudah ben Moses ben Daniel of Rome, contained in Add. 27033, comprising the *Bēur Ma'asēh Bērēshith* or "Exposition of the Work of Creation," commentaries on various passages of the Old Testament, and a series of introductory chapters to the prophetic books, sixty-five in number. Nor must I pass by in silence the *Gōdēr Perets* of Solomon Norzi, better known by the title of *Minchath Shai*, a critical and masoretic commentary on the whole Old Testament (Add. 27198). This volume is the author's autograph, dated 1626, and in it his

name is given in full, Jedidiah Solomon Raphael ben Abraham of Norzi.

Some of the above commentaries, especially those of Abraham ibn Ezra and Moses ben Nachman, were in their turn commented upon by later writers, principally cabbalists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Such are the *Mēirath Enayim* of Isaac ben Samuel of Acco (or Acre), a super-commentary on Nachmanides on the Pentateuch (Add. 27172); the *Mēgillath*

Sēthārīm of Samuel Motot (Add. 26981); the *סדר אדני ליראיו* of Ezra ben Solomon ben Gatigno (Add. 26981); and the *Avvath Nephesh* of Asher ben Abraham Crescas (Add. 26987);—all three upon Ibn Ezra on the Pentateuch.

The next branch of Hebrew literature which calls for attention is the later Talmudic, embracing the whole field of ceremonial and juridical law. And here we may distinguish: (1) *Pērūshīm* or commentaries on parts of the Talmūd; (2) *Tōsāphōth*, additions or appendices to the Talmūd, and *Chiddūshīm* or novells (*novelle*); (3) *Pēsākīm*, or decisions, and *Tēshūbōth*, judgments or opinions (*responsa*); and (4) systematic works on the whole or part of the field covered by the above. In all these departments the Almanzi library can show a goodly array of works, but space allows me to mention only a few of the more important.

Of the Talmudic commentators we have Chananel on the tract *Bābā Kammā*, a paper manuscript of the fifteenth century (Add. 27194), and on the tract *Erūbīn*, a paper manuscript of the fourteenth century (Add. 27197); whilst Add. 27196, a vellum manuscript of the fourteenth century, contains Solomon Isaakī (Rashi) on *Bābā Kammā* and *Bābā Mēts'ā*, along with Gershon ben Jehudah haz-Zākēn, called *Mēōr hag-Gōlāh*, or "The Light of the Exile," on *Bābā Bathrā*. Here too may be mentioned a batch of commentaries on the *Pirkē Abōth*, such as those of Solomon Isaakī and Isaiah of Trani (?) in Add. 27125; of Don Joseph ibn Shoshan and Bechai had-Daiyān (?) in Add. 26922; and of Isaac hak-Kōhēn ben Chaiyim ben Abraham, along with his commentary on the Song of Songs and the Lamentations, in Add. 26960.

Among the volumes of *Tōsāphōth* and *Chiddūshīm*, I may call attention to Add. 26915 and 27005, which are *תוספות ישנים* or "ancient *Tōsāphōth*." Add. 26988 contains *Tōsāphōth* to the tract *Bābā Kammā* by Perets ben Eliah of Corbeil; whilst in Add. 26989 we find *Tōsāphōth* of Sens (שנאי) to *Shabbath*, and those of Asher ben Jechiel to several other tracts. Of the *Chiddūshīm* of Moses ben Nachman there are several volumes

(Add. 27025, 27048, 27084, 27189, and 27185), as also of Nissim Gerondi (Add. 27024, 27118, and 27135), Solomon ibn Adereth (Add. 27092), and others.

Of the *Pōsēkim* (פוסקים) it may be sufficient to name Isaiah the elder (רי"י) of Trani (Add. 26893, written before A.D. 1462, Add. 26903, and Add. 26914, written before A.D. 1881), and Jacob ben Asher, whose compendium of the decisions of his father Asher ben Jechiel is found in Add. 27032.

Of the volumes of *Responsa*, or legal opinions, the Almanzi library contains a large number, reaching from the earliest period down to the last century. One of the oldest is Add. 27181, a paper manuscript of the fifteenth century, containing *Tēshūbōth hag-Gēōnīm*; whilst the recent Add. 26977 comprises responses of various ancient authorities. Further, we have the *Tēshūbōth* of Solomon ibn Adereth in Add. 26950 and 26983; of Simon Duran ben Tsemach in 27117; of Jacob Levi Molin (or Mölln) in 27111; of David ibn Abī Zimra (or Zamiro) in 26975; of Moses Provinciale in 26935; of Jacob Castro in 27183; of Jehudah Aryeh of Modena in 27148; of Isaac Levi Valle of Modena in 26942; and of Phineas Chai Anav of Ferrara in nine volumes, Add. 26905-913.

To the fourth class, or that of the more systematic ceremonial and judicial works, belong such books as the *Halāchōth*, or Talmudical compendium, of Isaac Al-Fāsī or Alphesi (Add. 27075, *Seder Nāshīm* and *Seder Nēzikīn*), with the emendations of Moses del Vecchio (*Tikkūnē hā-Rīph*, Add. 26990-992 and 27134). Further, the *Sēpher ham-Mitsvōth*, or book of precepts (סמ"ט), of Moses of Coucy (Add. 27040); with its practical abridgment, the *'Amūdē hag-Gōlāh* (סמ"ק), by Isaac of Corbeil (Add. 26982). In this latter manuscript, which seems to have been written at Zürich in 1391, there are copious supplements and glosses. Of the well-known *Tūrīm* of Jacob ben Asher there are several copies (Add. 26892, דושן המשפט; 27137, ditto; and 27150, אורח חיים and יורה דעה). Nor must I pass over in silence the *Sēpher hā-Rimmōn* of Moses ben Shem-tob of Leon (Add. 26920); the *איסור והיתיר* of Zedekiah Anav ben Abraham (Add. 26918, written before A.D. 1841); the *Sha'arē Dūrā* of Isaac of Düren (in Add. 26970, which is dated A.D. 1308); the *Hilchōth Shēchitāh* of Jehudah ben Benjamin (Add. 26955); the *Ba'alē han-Nephesh* of Abraham ben David (Add. 26894); and the *Tōrath hā-Adām* of Moses ben Nachman (Add. 26894).

Quitting the fields of theology and law, I proceed to those

of philosophy and the other sciences, in which, as we shall presently see, the Jews not only produced original works, but also availed themselves largely of the labours of their Christian and Mohammedan predecessors and contemporaries.

Under the head of *philosophy*, I include, for the sake of brevity, treatises on logic and ethics.

In this department the greatest name is that of Maimonides, of whose larger works there are two in the Almanzi library, viz., the *Môrêh han-Nêbûchîm*, translated from the original Arabic by Samuel ibn Tibbon (Add. 27068), and the *Millôth ha-Higgâyôn*, or treatise on logic, likewise translated from the Arabic by Moses ibn Tibbon (in Add. 27107). Of his lesser treatises there may be mentioned the *Maamar* (or *Iggereth*) *Tachyîth ham-Mêlîm*, on the resurrection of the dead, translated by Samuel ibn Tibbon (in Add. 26976 and 27179), and some of his letters (in Add. 27129 and 27131). Of the conflict that arose within the pale of Judaism between the believers in the old Talmudic creed and the school of Maimonides I cannot now speak. It must suffice for me to indicate a few of the writings on either side, such as the letters of Meir Abulafia hal-Lêvî of Toledo, Aaron ben Meshullam of Lunel, and Shimshon ben Abraham of Sens (in Add. 26976); the letter of Moses ben Nachman (in Add. 27131); the *Rûach Chên* of Jacob Anatolio and the *Mêshârêth Môsheh* of Kalonymus (both in Add. 27179); and the letter of Solomon ibn Adereth to the synagogues of the Provence against the study of philosophy (in Add. 27129).

Of older date than Maimonides are Bechai ben Joseph and the famous Solomon ibn Gabirol, better known as Avicbron, who both wrote in Arabic. The *Chôbôth hal-Lêbâbôth* ("Duties of the Heart") of the former writer was done into Hebrew by Jehudah ibn Tibbon (Add. 26952; with an abridgment in 26899). The same indefatigable translator made versions of Ibn Gabirol's ethical treatise *Tikkûn Middôth han-Nephesh* (in Add. 26899), and of his collection of apophthegms, under the title of *Mibchar hap-Pênîm*, or "Choice Pearls" (in Add. 26924).

Among later works I can only mention the *Ma'alôth ham-Middôth* of Jechiel ben Jekuthiel ben Benjamin (Add. 26974); the metaphysical dissertation of Don Isaac Abravanel, entitled *Tsûrath hai-Yêsôdôth* (in Add. 27107); and the *Michlal Yophi*, or logic, of Jehudah ben Jechiel or Messer Leon (Add. 27087).

As additional examples of translations I may specify the *Sêpher han-Nephesh*, or *Liber de Anima*, ascribed to Galen, translated from the Arabic by Jehudah Al-Charîzî (in Add.

27181); the *Sēpher hat-Tappūach*, or *Liber de Pomo*, a pseudo-Aristotelian treatise, likewise translated from the Arabic by Abraham ibn Chisdai (in Add. 27144); and the *Sēpher Trattata mē-Higgāyōn dī Messer Piero Sēphardī*, a version of the *Parva Logicalia* of Petrus Hispanus by Abraham Abigdor ben Meshullam (in Add. 27087 and 27153). The treatise of Aristotle *De Anima* was done into Hebrew by Jehudah ben Moses, but of this we have only the translator's preface to the third book in Add. 27173.

In the *mathematical sciences* and *arithmetic* the activity of the Jewish writers and translators was as great as in the philosophical.

Among the original treatises in the Almanzi collection, the following are, I believe, the most noteworthy. Of Abraham ben Chiyā we possess two works, viz., the *Cheshbōn hā-'Ibbūr*, on the calendar (Add. 26899), and the *Cheshbōn ham-Mahalāchōth*, or "Calculation of the Courses of the Stars" (Add. 27106). A tract on the astrolabe by Abraham ibn Ezra is contained in Add. 26984. The *Rōba' Yisrā'el*, a treatise on the quadrant (רביע עולם) by the celebrated Jacob ben Machir, called Don Prophiat Tibbon or Prophatius, is extant in Add. 26984. The *Shēsh Kēnāphīm* ("Six Wings") or astronomical tables of Immanuel ben Jacob are to be found in Add. 27101, with short commentaries upon them in Add. 27106 and 27153; whilst in Add. 26984 we have the *'Erech ha-Chillūph*, or "Measure of the difference (in the length of the days and nights)," by the same author. The manuscript Add. 26921 contains three sets of astronomical tables, viz., the *Lūchōth* of Levi ben Gershon, the *Orach Sēlūlāh* of Isaac ibn Al-Chadib, and the *Tōb Pō'el* of Jacob ben David ben Yom-tob Poel. In Add. 27107 there is a description of an instrument for taking observations (כלי דמחשבה) by Jehudah ibn Verga, and a treatise on the sphere (*Tōlēdōth hash-Shāmayim vē-hā-'Aretz*) by the same mathematician; the second book of a mathematical treatise by Mordechai Comtino, entitled *Chochmath ham-Middōth*; and two tracts on the asymptotes, the one by Solomon ben Isaac, the other by Moses Provinciale.

Among the translations in this branch of science I would call attention to the treatises of Ptolemy on the astrolabe and on the planisphere (addressed to Syrus), both in Add. 26984. In Add. 26921 we have the *Theorica Planetarum* of Gerard of Cremona, translated by Jehudah ben Samuel Shalom under the title of *'Iyyūn Kōchēbē Lecheth*. Solomon ben Abraham Abigdor gave a version of the treatise of Arnaldus de Villa Nova *De*

Judiciis Astronomiæ or *Capitula Astrologiæ*, entitled *Pānīm bē-Mishpāt* (Add. 27106); and the same translator rendered the *Tractatus de Sphæra Mundi* of our countryman Joannes de Sacrobosco (John Holywood) into Hebrew, calling it *Mar'eh Ophannim* (Add. 27106). To Jacob Anatolio we owe the translation of Al-Farghānī's elements of astronomy, and to Jacob ben Machir that of Kostā ibn Lūkā on the sphere. Both of these works are contained in Add. 27107.

Of *arithmetical* treatises it must be enough to name the compendium (*Kitstsūr ham-Mispār*) of Jehudah ibn Verga (Add. 27107); the *Dinē Māmōnōth* of Gad Astruc ben Jacob (Add. 27039); and the extracts from the *Summa Arithmeticiæ et Geometriæ* of Lucas Pacioli (Add. 27039).

Medicine and *natural history* are but poorly represented in the Almanzi library. I may just mention in passing the *Chamishshim Sha'arē Rēphūōth*, or fifty medical precepts, of Maimonides (in Add. 27089); the *Sēpher Agūr*, or Aphorisms of Hippocrates, and the *Middōth Abūkrat*, a tract ascribed to the same writer (in Add. 27018); some extracts from the book of *Asaph* (also in Add. 27018); and the *Maamārē hab-Bēhēmōth*, on the medicinal properties of various animals (in Add. 27001). The volume Add. 27170 is an anonymous *Sēpher Rēphūōth*, or book of recipes, of considerable antiquity.

Nor is there much of value in the department of *linguistic* study, all the older grammars and dictionaries being unfortunately "conspicuous by their absence." Add. 27047 contains the *Ma'asēh Ephōd* of Prophiat Duran; Add. 27094, the *Libnath has-Sappir* of Jehudah Messer Leon ben Jechiel, of which there is a fragment also in Add. 27153; and in Add. 27011 we have the *Masōreth ham-Masōreth* of Elias Levita,* and copious extracts from the *'Arūgath hab-Bōsem* of Samuel Archevolti.

History and *travels* are again almost a blank. In the latter department I can name only the Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela (in Add. 27089); in the former, nothing but Josippon ben Gorion (Add. 27136), and the *'Emek hab-Bāchā*, or "Vale of Tears," by Joseph hak-Kōhēn (Add. 27122, which is valuable as being the author's autograph, completed A.D. 1575).

In *poetry* and *romance* we fare somewhat better. Of the *Mikdash Mē'at* of Moses of Rieti, who has been somewhat absurdly called "the Hebrew Dante," there are four copies, more or less complete (Add. 27001, 27012, copied from the author's autograph by his great-grandson, 27121, 27129); and in Add.

* Add. 27199 contains some works of Elasar of Worms, copied by Elias Levita in 1515 for the Cardinal Egidio Canini of Viterbo.

26916 we have a specimen of Ovid in Hebrew garb, viz., the first three books of the *Metamorphoses*, translated by Shabbēthai Marini of Padua from the Italian version of Giovanni Andrea dell' Anguillara. Of far more importance than these, however, are the two fine manuscripts (Add. 27112 and 27113) of the *Tachkēmōnī* or *Makāmas* of Jehudah Al-Charizī, written in imitation of those of the Arabian Al-Harīrī. Add. 27113, which also contains the *Minchath Yēhūdāh Sōnē han-Nāshīm*, or *Makāmatu 'z-Ziwāj*, of Jehudah ibn Shabbēthai ha-Lēvī, is the oldest extant copy of these works, having been written in Spain in 1282, only about fifty years after the death of Al-Charizī. In Add. 27168 we possess another treasure, the (as I believe) only extant copy of the *Divān* or collected poems and poetical epistles of Abraham Bedarshī, i. e., of Beziers in the Provence. The same volume comprises the *Bakkāshōth* or prayers of Abraham Bedarshī and his son Jedaiah hap-Pēnīnī, the collected poems of Samuel ben Joseph ibn Sason, and various poems by Don Vidal Benveniste, Solomon ben Labī, Solomon Bonfed, Solomon da Piera, and other Spanish and Provençal Jews.

The Almanzi library contains, as might naturally be expected, a large number of cabbalistic works by all the principal writers in that branch of Hebrew literature, commencing with the *Kether Shēm Tōb* of Abraham of Cologne (Add. 27076, 27179) and the *Gannath Egōz* of Joseph Gikatilia or Chiquitillo (Add. 27114). But as these books are not likely to attract the attention of students at the present day, I shall merely call attention, on account of its rarity, to the *Or Yākār* of Moses Cordovero (Add. 27026-27, 27041-42, and 27058-67).

I have thus endeavoured to convey to the readers of *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, in as narrow a compass as possible, some idea of the contents of the library collected by a Hebrew merchant in a, comparatively speaking, small city in the north of Italy. Would that some of our Jewish countrymen, many of whom have as good opportunities and larger means, would follow the example of Giuseppe Almanzi, and aid in preserving the manuscript remains of their national literature!

In conclusion, I may add that, about the same time as the Almanzi library, the Trustees of the British Museum obtained by purchase a dozen other Hebrew manuscripts of considerable rarity and value. Of these the following are the most interesting.

(1.) Add. 26881 is a fine copy on vellum of the *'Arūch* or Talmudic lexicon of Nathan ben Jechiel, probably written towards the end of the twelfth century. It is, unfortunately, slightly imperfect at the beginning and end.

(2.) Add. 27214 is a magnificent copy on vellum of the

Hebrew dictionary of Menachem ben Saruk, dated A.D. 1091, but, alas, imperfect at the commencement as far as the radical נפנ. This is probably the oldest manuscript of the work in existence. The Trustees already possessed another, likewise imperfect, dated A.D. 1185 (Arund. Orient. 51). Both these volumes also contain the strictures or critical remarks of Dunash ben Labrat on the dictionary of Menachem; but in Add. 27214 we have besides the only existing copy of the criticisms of Dunash on Saadiah hag-Gaon.

(3.) Add. 27293 contains the *Piskē hā-Rōsh*, or decisions of Asher ben Jechiel, on the *Sēder Mō'ēd*. This manuscript, which is on paper and is, unhappily, a good deal injured, was written at Toledo in 1366, not quite forty years after the death of the author, and is in all probability the oldest copy extant.

(4.) Add. 27294 is a commentary on passages of the *Sēpher ham-Maddā'*, or "book of Science," the first book of the *Yād ha-Chazākāh* of Maimonides, composed in *Arabic* by 'Alāü 'd-Dīn Al-Muwakkīt. The scribe, by name Sa'id ibn Dāūd Al-'Adanī, copied it in Hebrew characters, at Aleppo, from a manuscript which belonged to the great-great-great-grandson of Maimonides.

W. WRIGHT.

Ancient Egyptians' Mode of Embalming.—They first extracted the brains through the nostrils by means of a curved iron probe, and filled the head with drugs; then, making an incision in the side with a sharp Ethiopian stone, they drew out the intestines, and filled the cavity with powdered myrrh, cassia, and other perfumes, frankincense excepted. After sewing it up again, they kept the body in natron for seventy days, and then wrapt it up entirely with bands of fine linen, smeared with gum, and laid it in a wooden case, made in the shape of a man, which they placed upright against the wall. This was the first class, or "Osiris style," of embalming; but, as it was very expensive, it was confined to the richest people. Another mode consisted in injecting oil of cedar into the body, without removing the intestines; whilst, for the third manner, reserved to the poorer classes, the body was merely cleansed with syrmos and salt, subjecting it, in both cases, to a natron bath, which completely dried the flesh. The first kind of embalming cost a talent, or about £250, the second twenty-two minas, or £80, and the third was extremely cheap. These operations were performed by some persons regularly appointed for the purpose, and at Thebes there was a whole quarter of the town devoted to the preparation of the necessary implements. One of the most curious parts of the performance was that the *poraschistes*, or dissector, who had to make an incision in the body, ran away as soon as it was done, amid the bitter execrations of all those present, who pelted him unmercifully with stones, to testify their abhorrence of any one inflicting injury on a human creature, either alive or dead.

EARLY ENGLISH RELIGIOUS POETRY.*

IN the fourth century the Gothic bishop Ulphilas deeply felt, from his own experience, that the power of the Word of God to convince the understanding and to influence the conduct would be limited, unless it were not only preached, but read in the mother tongue, through which the best affections of the heart are most easily touched.^b The conviction which led Ulphilas to translate the whole of the New Testament and part of the Old into Gothic, seems never to have died away from the minds of the people of Northern Europe. What Ulphilas did for the Goths our venerable Bede did some three hundred and fifty years later for the Anglo-Saxons. We are not certain that Bede was the first to translate the Scriptures into Anglo-Saxon, but there is indisputable evidence that they were constantly read in the Anglo-Saxon churches. Cuthbert's touching narrative of the last hours of Bede, and of his anxiety to finish his translation before death should put an end to his work for ever, is too well known to need a place here. It shews, indeed, the spirit with which the work was begun, and was a worthy token of the perseverance with which it would be carried on.

It is perhaps worthy of note that we know of no persecution for translating the Scriptures into the vernacular before the time of Wiclif. Many had translated portions of Scripture, and many were the paraphrases which appeared; but they all seem to have passed unchallenged, though made avowedly for unlearned men. And the accusations brought against Wiclif were not for this; heresy was the crime with which he was accused. He had also incurred the displeasure of Urban for defending Edward III. in his refusal to continue the payment of the tribute which had been exacted from the days of John. Add to these the hatred of the friars for his successful attacks upon them, and we need seek no further cause for persecution. That Rome did no more towards translating the Bible must always be a stain upon her: that, in earlier times, she allowed so much to be done, may be mentioned in her favour. We are

* 1. *Early English Alliterative Poems, in the West-Midland Dialect of the Fourteenth Century.* Copied and Edited from a unique manuscript in the Library of the British Museum. With an Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By Richard Morris. London: Trübner and Co. 1864.

2. *The Story of Genesis and Exodus.* An Early English Song, about A.D. 1250. Now first Edited, from a unique manuscript in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By Richard Morris. London: Trübner and Co. 1865.

^b *The Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Wycliffe, and Tyndale Gospels.* Edited by Dr. Bosworth. Preface, i.

not endeavouring to detract in any way from Wiclif's renown, for he was the first who seriously set himself to accomplish the gigantic task of placing the whole Bible before the people. Others had done something: some more, some less; but all are deserving of honour, and though their names have, for the most part, been irrecoverably lost, their work ought never to be forgotten, and we ought ever to look upon them as benefactors of our race. Error we find and much; of idle tales many: but we are disposed to look with much charity upon these things, remembering the age of our country in which they were written, and the rude condition of the "lewd," for whom, especially, the writings were made.

In our former articles* we have treated this subject generally; but now, using such materials as we have at hand, we propose to deal only with translations and paraphrases of Scripture. We have already given some specimens, but enough remains behind to justify us in returning to the subject. First in time and first in importance is the *Story of Genesis and Exodus*, recently edited for the Early English Text Society. "It seems to have been the object of the author to present to his readers, in as few words as possible, the most important facts in the Books of Genesis and Exodus, without any elaboration or comment, and he has, therefore, omitted such facts as were not essentially necessary to the completeness of his narrative: while, on the other hand, he has included certain portions of the Books of Numbers and Deuteronomy, so as to present to his readers a complete history of the wanderings of the Israelites, and the life of Moses their leader."^d At the opening of the poem we are told that man ought to love those who instruct the unlearned, so that he who is not learned in books may love and serve God. We are also told that this song is turned out of Latin into English, and how we ought to rejoice to hear the story of man's bliss and sorrow, and how salvation came by Jesus Christ. The author then invokes the divine assistance to enable him to sing the creation of the world, which was wrought with wit, wisdom, and love.

"Tho so wurth ligt so god it bad,
Fro thisternessee o sunde[r] sad;
That was the firme morgen tid,
That euere sprong in world wid.
With that ligt worn angles wrogt,
And in-to newe heuene brogt,

* See *J. S. L.*, New Series, No. XIV., p. 249; No. XVI., p. 380.

^d Editor's Preface, p. vii.

That is ouer dis walkenes turn,
 God hem quoad thor seli suriurn;
 Summe for pride fellen thethen,
 In to this thhisternesse her bi-nethan;
 Pride made angel deuol dwale,
 That made ilc sorge, and euerilc bale,
 And euerilc wunder, and euerilc wo,
 That is, or sal ben euere mo.
 He was mad on the sunedai,
 He fel out on the munendai."

Forth then glided the first light, and afterwards came the first night. Thus, in the welkin's course comes day and night of twenty-four hours, which "frenkis men" call "*un sur natural*."

"And ever went the day before,
 Since that new world was born,
 Till Jesus Christ from hell took
 His beloved with Eve and Adam;
 From that time we reckon aye,
 First the night and then the day,
 For God led them from hell's night
 To Paradise's precious light."

Each day's work in Creation is carefully described, some containing more explanatory matter, some less. Thus, in the sixth day's work we are told that God knew Adam would sin, so he made tame cattle to help him in his labour, and to give him food and clothing, while the "wild deer" were made to trouble him with sorrow and dread, and cause him to bemoan his sinfulness. All were good while Adam remained pure; but reptiles and wild beasts hurt man, lions and bears tear him, and flies have no awe of him, as soon as he became sinful. The creation of man is thus described:—

"Dis sexte dai god made Adam,
 And his licham of erthe he nam,
 And blew thor-in a liues blast,
 A liknesse of his hali gast,
 A spirit ful of wit and skil;
 Thor quoules it folgede heli wil,
 God self thor quile liket is,
 An un-lif quanne it wile mis.
 [I]N feld damaske adam was mad,
 And thethen fer on londe sad;
 God bar him in-to paradis,
 An erd al ful of swete blis;

fol wel he wid him thor dede,
bi-tagte him al that mirie stede."^a

After the beasts had been brought to Adam for him to name them,—

"God caused him to fall into a swoon,
And in that swoon He let him see
Much that after should befall."^f

With one more quotation we must leave our author's version of the creation and fall. Our readers will easily recognize Genesis iii. 9, etc.

"After this dede a steuone cam,
'Thu, nu, quor art, adam, adam?'
'Louerd, quat same is me bi-tid,
For ic am naked and haue me hid?'
'Quo seide the dat gu wer naked;
Thu haues the sorges sigthhe waked,
For thhu min bode-word haues broken,
Thhu salt ben ut in sorge loken,
In swinc thu salt tilen thi mete[n],
Thin bred wid swotes teres eten,
Til gu beas eft in to erthe cumen,
Quer-of gu beas to manne numen;

* In the *Castel off Loue* the creation of Adam is placed in Hebron:—

"And tho he hedde al wel i-don,
He com to the valeye of Ebron,
Ther he made Adam [and-last] so riche
Of eorthe, after hym selfe i-liche."—Lines 125—129.

Sir John Maundeville in speaking of Hebron says:—"And righte faste by that place is a cave in the roche, where Adam and Eve duelleden, whan thei weren putt out of Paradyse; and there geten thei here children." And in that same place was Adam formed and made. Chaucer (*Monke's Tale*, 14,013) says:—

"Lo, Adam, in the field of Damascene
With God's own finger wrought was he."

With the above compare Early English Poems, iii., 87:—

"In the vale of eboir his liuelode he most swink sore."

And Roberte the Deuyll, lines 711-712:—

"Synce Adam was made in Canaan of clays,
I am the greatest synner that lyued on groundes."

—See *Castel off Loue*, p. 6, note.

^f Cf. Milton's *Paradise Lost*, book xi., 366 et seq.:—

"Ascend
This hill; let Eve (for I have drench'd her eyes)
Here sleep below, while thou to foresight wak'st;
As once thou sleptst, while she to life was form'd."

And wif sal under were wimen,
 In heterile birthhe sorge numen;
 And nithful neddre, loth an lither,
 Sal gliden on hise brest nether,
 And erthe freten wile he mai liuen,
 And atter on is tunge cliuen;
 And nith, and strif, and ate, and san,
 Sal ben bi-twen neddre and wimman;
 And get sal wimman ouercumen,
 His heued under fote bi-numen.' "

Lamech occupies a not unimportant place in the poem under notice, and, though the greater part of it can hardly be called a translation of Scripture, we may be excused a quotation for the information contained in it. We are told—

"Lamech is at the sexte kne,
 The seuende man after adam,
 That of caymes kinde cam.
 This lamech was the firme man,
 The bigamie first bi-gan.
 Bigamie is unkinde thing,
 On engleis tale, twie-wifing;
 for ai was rigt and kire bi-forn,
 On man, on wif, til he was boren.
 Lamech him two wifes nam,
 On adda, an nother wif sellam."

The story of the death of Cain by the hand of Lamech may well be inserted here. It is scarcely necessary to say that the incident referred to is given with remarkable brevity in the Bible. In Gen. iv. 23, 24, the Authorized Version is, "Hear my voice, ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech; for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold." Without entering into the meaning of this remarkable and obscure passage we present our early translator's version, which, to say the least, is free from all doubt as to its meaning.

"Lamech ledde long lif til than
 That he wurth bisne, and haued a man
 That ledde him ofte wudes ner,
 To scheten after the wilde der;
 Al-so he mistagte, also he schet,
 And caim in the wude is let;
 His knape wende it were a der,
 An lamech droge is arwe ner,

And let et flegen of the streng,
 Caim unwarde it under-feng,
 Grusnede, and strekede, and starf with-than.
 Lamech with wrethe is knape nam,
 Vn-bente is boge, and bet, and slog,
 Til he fel dun on dedes swog.
 Twin-wifing ant twin-manslagt
 Of his soule beth mikel hagt."

The poet's account of the Deluge we pass over, the more willingly as we have before given one early rendering of this important point of Bible history.^s

As a specimen of the author's closest rendering of the sacred narrative we select Genesis xv. :—

"Abel primices first bi-gan,
 And decimas first abram;^a
 Nu ist so boden and so bitagt,
 Quo-so his alt him bi agt.
 After this spac god to abram :—
 'Thin berg and tin werger ic ham.
 Thin swinc the sal ben gulden wel,
 wid michel welthe in good sel.'
 Quad he, 'quat sal me welthes ware,
 Quane is child-les of werlde fare;
 Damak eliezeres sune,
 In al min welthe sal he wunen ?'
 Quat god, 'so sal it nogt ben,
 Of the self sal thin erward ten.'
 Abram leuede this hot in sped,
 dat was him to rigt-wished.
 Thre der he too, ilc thre ger hold,
 And sacrede god on an wold;
 of godes bode he nam god kep,
 A net, and a got, and a sep;
 Euerile of these he delte on two,
 And let hem lin on sunder so,
 Vndelt hes leide quor-so hes tok;
 And thor a duue and a turtul ok,
 Sat up on-rum til heuene he tok,
 And of tho doles kep he nam
 Gredi foueles fellen thor-on,
 That thogte abram wel iwel don,

^s See *J. S. L.*, New Series, No. XIV., p. 269.

^a Some of the critics have made out from these two lines that the author was anxious to uphold the priesthood,—they apparently forget Genesis xiv. 20, "And he—Abram—gave him tithes of all." Of course we do not deny that the author may have been a priest, but priest or no priest, it seems hardly fair to charge him with having an eye to his order, on such slender grounds.

kagte is wei, quan it was nigt,
 Tho cam on him ygging and frigt;
 A michel fier he sag, and an brigt,
 gliden thor twen tho doles rigt.
 God seide him thor a sothe drem
 The timinge of is beren-tam,
 And hu he sulde in pine ben,
 And uten erdes sorge sen;
 fowre hundred ger sulden ben gon,
 Hor he sulden wel cumen a-gon,
 oc sithen sulde in here hond,
 bi-cumen that hotene lond.
 Tho wiste abram wel michel mor
 Quat was to cumen than he wiste or."

The temptation of Abraham is another fair specimen of the author's abilities.

" Iff iosephus ne legeth me,
 Thor quiles he wunede in bersabe,
 so was ysaaces eld told
 xx. and five winter old;
 Tho herde abraham steuene fro gode,
 Newe tiding, and selkuth bode:—
 ' Tac thin sune ysaac in hond,
 And far with him to sithhinges lond,
 And thor thu salt him offren me
 On an hil thor ic sal taunen the.'
 fro bersabe iurnes two
 Was that lond that he bed him two;
 And morie, men seith, was that hil,
 That god him tawne[de] in his wil;
 Men seith that dune-is sithen on
 Was mad temple salamon,
 And the auter mad on that stede
 Thor abraham he offrande dede,
 Abraham was buxum o rigt,
 Hise weie he tok sone bi nigt;
 The thride day he sagt the stede
 The god him witen in herte dede;
 Than he cam dun to tho dunes fot,
 Non of his men forthere ne mot,
 But ysaac is dere childe,
 He bar the wude with herte mild,
 And abraham the fier and the swerd bar;
 Tho wurth the child witter and war
 That thor sal offrende ben don,
 Oc ne wiste he quuat, ne quor-on;

'fader,' quath he, 'quar sal ben taken
 The offrende that thu wilt maken ?'
 Quat abraham, 'god sal bi-sen,
 Quor-of the ofrende sal ben;
 Sellik thu art on wer[1]de cumen,
 Sellic thu salt ben hethen numen;
 With-uten long throwing and figt,
 God wile the taken of werlde nigt,
 And of the seluen holocaustum hauen,
 Thanc it him that he it wulde crauen.'
 Ysaac was redi mildelike,
 Quan that he it wiste witterlike.
 Oc abraham it wulde wel
 quat-so god bad, thwerted he it neuer a del;
 Ysaac was leid that auter on,
 So men sulden holocaust don;
 And abraham that swerd ut-drog,
 And was redi to slon him nuge,
 Oc angel it him for-bed,
 And barg the child fro the dead;
 Tho wurth abraham frigi fagen,
 For ysaac bi-leaf un-slagen;
 Bi-aften bak, as he nam kep,
 faste in thornes he sag a sep,
 That an angel thor-inne dede;
 It was brent on ysaac stede.
 And or abraham thethen for,
 God him thor bi him-seluen swor
 That he sal michil his kinde maken,
 And that lond hem to honde taken;
 Good selthhe sal him cumen on,
 for he this dede wulde don."

Genesis occupys about five-eighths of the whole poem, and ends with a prayer for him who translated it into English, "that God would shield his soul from hell-bale, and protect him from hell-pain, cold and hot; and all men who will hear it, God grant that they may dwell in bliss among angels and good men for ever."

"Godes bliscing be with vs,
 Her nu bi-ginneth exodus,"

is the opening of the second part of the poem. "The eighth king Ammaphis," we are told, treated the Israelites harshly, and the Egyptians themselves became jealous of them, and set them to all kinds of servile work, which must, indeed, have "made their lives bitter." Exodus i. 14 is worked out to such an extent that one would hardly recognize it, nevertheless we

give the passage in full to shew the kind of works which an early Englishman supposed were laid upon the Hebrews.

"Tho sette sundri hem to waken
His tigel and lim, and walles maken,
burges feten; and ramesen
Thurge here swinc it walled ben;
Summe he deden in vn-thewed swinc,
for it was fugel and ful o stinc,
Muc and fen ut of burges beren,
Thus bitterlike he gun hem deren;
The thridde swinc was eui and stron[g],
He deden hem crepen dikes long,
And wide a-buten burges gon,
And cumen ther ear was non;
And if that folc hem wulde deren,
The dikes comb hem sulde weren.
for al that swinc heui & sor,
Ay wex that kinde, mor & mor,
And thhogen, & spredden in londe thor,
That made the kinges herte ful sor."

We cannot do better, in closing our extracts from this very curious and very early translation of a part of God's word, than give the third chapter of Exodus in its early English dress.

"Tho sag moyses, at munt synay,
An swithe ferli sigt thor-bi,
fier brennen on the grene leaf,
And thog grene and hol bi-leaf;
forth he nam to sen witterlike,
Hu that fier brende milde-like;
Vt of that busk, the brende and thheg,
God sente an steuene, brigt and heg;
'Moyeses, moyses, do of thin son,
Thu stondes seli stede up-on;
Hic am god the in min geming nam
Iacob, ysaa, and abraham;
ic haue min folkes pine sogen,
That he nu longe hauen drogen;
Nu am ic ligt to fren hem theden,
And milche and hunige lond hem quethen;
An .vii. kinge-riches lond
Ic sal hem bringen al on hond.
Cum, thu salt ben min sondere man,
Ic sal the techen wel to than;
Thu salt min folc bringen a-gen,
And her thu salt min migte sen;
And thu salt seien to faraon,
That he lete min folc ut-gon;

If he it wernie and be thór-gen,
 Ic sal the techen hu it sal ben;
 for ic sal werken ferlike strong,
 And maken min folc frelike ut-gong;
 Ge sulen cumen with feteles & srud,
 And reuen egipte that is nu prud.
 Werp nu to token dun that wond.
 And it warp vt of hise hond,
 And wurth sone an uglike snake,
 And moyses fleg for dredes sake;
 God him bad, bi the tail he it nam,
 And it, a-non, a wond it bi-cam,
 And in hise bosum he dede his hond,
 Quit and al unfer he it fond;
 And sone he dede it eft agen,
 Al hel and fer he wiste it sen.
 'If he for thise tokenes two
 Ne liftethe ne troweth to,
 Go, get the water of de flod
 On the erthe, and it sal wurthen blod.'
 'Louerd, ic am wanmol, vn-reken
 Of wurdes, and may ic Iuel speken.
 Nu is forth gon the thridde dai,
 Sende an other; better he mai.'
 'Quo made domme, and quo specande?
 Quo made bisne, and quo lockende?
 Quo but ic, that haue al wrogt?
 Of me sal fultum ben the brogt.'
 'Louerd, sent him that is to cumen,
 Vgging and dred me haued numen.'
 'Aaron thin brother can wel speken,
 Thu salt him meten and vnsteken
 Him bodeword min, and ic sal red
 Gunc bothen bringen read and sped.'''

It will have been seen from the quotations previously given that some of them keep very close to the letter of Scripture; some are, more accurately speaking, paraphrases rather than translations; while others betray the fact that the writer gave at times the rein to his fancy, or allowed himself to be led away by legends and ideas which may have been common in his day. Still these fancies of his are slight, and have but little in them which could prove detrimental to the object which he had before him, namely, to set the early history of God's people before the common people of England, in their own language. That he succeeded in his aim few who carefully study this volume will deny.

Accepting Mr. Morris's conjecture that it was the author's

object "to present to his readers . . . the most important facts contained in the Books of Genesis and Exodus," we are not a little surprised to find him omitting among other things such striking passages as Genesis xlviii., and xlix. 1—27. If it is argued that they are not essential to his narrative, we may object that much that he has added to the sacred narrative was unessential. But while much is omitted from Genesis and Exodus which may have been wisely omitted, there are several chapters of Numbers¹ and one chapter of Deuteronomy² inserted. In these omissions and additions we fail to perceive, with the Editor, that "we might infer that our author intended to include in his song much more of the Bible narrative than we have in the present work."³ It is true that at the opening of the poem the author tells us that men ought to be glad to hear the story of man's bliss and sorrow, and how salvation came through Jesus Christ, who destroyed the power of Satan; but we do not think he intended by this to convey the impression that he would sing "Paradise Regained," although he refers to the subject more than once.

We will now refer again to some of the specimens of Early Poetry previously noticed by us, and of which examples have already appeared in this Journal.⁴ In the *Alliterative Poems* we meet with the following paraphrase of Jonah's prayer in the whale's belly:—

"Then a prayer ful prest the prophete ther maked
 On this wyse, as I wene, his wordes were mony.
 Lorde to the haf I cleped, in cares ful stronge,
 Out of the hole thou me herde, of hellen wombe
 I calde, & thou knew myn vncler steuen;
 Thou diptes me of the depe se, in-to the dymme hert,
 The grete flem of thy flod folded me vmbe;
 Alle the gotes of thy guferes, & groundeles powles,
 & thy stryuande st.emes of stryndes so mony,
 In on daschande dam, dryues me ouer;
 & get I say, as I seet in the se bothem,
 ' Careful am I kest out fro thy cler ygen
 & deseuered fro thy sygt; get surely I hope,
 Efte to trede on thy temple & teme to thy seluen.
 I am wrapped in water to my wo stoundes,
 The abyeme byndes the body that I byde inne;
 The pure poplande hourly playes on my heued,
 To laste mere of vche a mounste man am I fallen;

¹ Chapters xi.; xii.; xiii.; xiv.; xvi.; xvii.; xix.; xx.; xxi.; xxii.; xxiii.; xxiv.; xxv.; xxvi.; xxvii.; xxxi.

² xxxiv. ³ Preface, vii., note.

⁴ See *Journal of Sacred Literature*, No. XLV., p. 249; No. XVI., p. 380.

The barres of vche a bonk ful bigly me haldes,
 That I may lachche no lont & thou my lyf weldes ;
 Thou schal releue me renk, whil thy rygt slepes,
 Thurg mygt of thy mercy that mukel is to tryste.
 For when thaccos of anguych wats hid in my sawle,
 Thenne I remembred me rygt of my rych lorde,
 Prayande him for peté his prophete to here,
 That in-to his holy hous myn oriscoun mogt entré.
 I haf meled with thy maystres mony longe day,
 But now I wot wyterly, that those vnwyse ledes
 That affyen hym in vanyté & in vayne thynges,
 For think that mountes to nogt, her mercy forsaken ;
 Bot I dewoutly awowe that veray betes halden,
 Soberly to do the sacrafyse when I schal saue worthe,
 & offer the for my hele a ful hol gyfte,
 & halde goud that thou me hetes ; haf here my trauthes."

If our readers will compare this with the authorized version, they will perceive a power and beauty in the rendering which we could scarcely hope to surpass even now ; and no less forcible is the account of Jonah's preaching and its results. The passage quoted is, as will be perceived, an expansion of Jonah iii. 4-9 :—

* It may not be without interest to insert here a passage from Dr. Burgess's translation of the "Repentance of Nineveh," by Ephraem Syrus. The reader will note for himself the resemblances of the two poets as well as their differences. We only give a portion of what Ephraem says :—

"The just man, Jonah, opened his mouth ;
 Nineveh listened and was troubled.
 A single Hebrew preacher
 Made the whole city to fear.
 His mouth spake and delivered its doom,
 And distributed death to his hearers.
 The feeble herald stood up,
 In a city of mighty men.
 His voice broke the heart of kings,
 He overturned the city upon them.
 By one word which cut off hope,
 He made them drink the cup of wrath.
 Kings heard him and were humbled,
 They threw away their crowns and became lowly ;
 Noble men listened and were filled with consternation,
 Instead of robes they clothed themselves with sackcloth ;
 Venerable old men heard him,
 And covered their heads with ashes ;
 Rich men heard him and laid open
 Their treasures before the poor ;
 Those heard him who had lent to others,
 And gave their bills as alms ;
 Debtors heard him and became just,
 So as not to deny their obligation ;
 Borrowers returned what they owed ;
 Creditors became forgiving ;
 Every man, respecting his salvation,
 Became righteously solicitous.

"Get schal forty dayes fully fare to an ende,
 & thenne schal Ninie be nomen & to nogt worthe;
 Truly this ilk toun schal tylte to grounde,
 Vp-so-doun schal ge dumpe depe to the abyne,
 To be swolged swyfly wyth the swart erthe,
 & alle that lyuyes here-inne lose the swete.
 This speche sprang in that space & spradde alle aboute,
 To borges & to bacheleres, that in that burs lenged;
 Such a hidor hem hent & a hatel drede,
 That all chaunged her chere & chylled at the hert.
 The segge sesed not get, bot sayde euer ilyche
 'The verray vengauce of god schal voyde this place.'
 Thenne the peple pitosly pleyned ful styлле,
 & for the drede of drygtyn doured in hert;
 Heter hayres thay hent that asperly bited,
 & those thay bounden to her bak & to her bar sydes,
 Dropped dust on her hede & dymly bisogten,
 That that penaunce plesed him that playnes on her wronge.
 & ay he cryes in that kyth tyl the kyng herde;
 And he radly vp-ros & ran fro his chayer,
 His ryche robe he to rof of his rigge naked,

No man was found there,
 Who contrived how he might defraud;
 They contended in a holy strife,
 How each should gain his soul.
 Robbers listened to Jonah,
 And men of rapine left that which was their own.
 Every man judged himself,
 And was merciful to his fellow;
 No one judged his companion,
 For each one judged himself.
 Every man reproved himself,
 For wrath was reproving all men.
 Murderers heard him and made confession,
 For they cast off the fear of judges;
 Judges also heard him and neglected *their office*;
 Through the *impending* wrath plaints were silent;
 They were unwilling to judge, even righteously,
 Lest they should be righteously condemned.
 Every man sowed mercy,
 That from it he might reap salvation.

Sinners listened to Jonah,
 And each one confessed his sins.
 The polluted city heard him,
 And quickly put off its abominations.
 Masters also heard him,
 And proclaimed freedom to their bondsmen;
 Slaves heard him in righteousness,
 And increased their respect for their masters.
 At the voice of Jonah honourable women
 Brought down their pride in sackcloth;
 The repentance was indeed sincere,
 When haughty women put on humility!"

& of a hepe of askes he hitte in the myddes;
 He askes heterly a hayre & hasped hym vmbre,
 Sewed a sekke ther abof, and syked ful colde;
 Ther he dased in that duste, with droppande teres,
 Wepande ful wonderly alle his wrange dedes.
 Thenne sayde he to his seriauntes, 'samnes yow bilyue,
 Do dryue out a decre demed of my seluen,
 That alle the bodyes that ben withinne this bors quyk,
 Bothe burnes & bestes, burdes and childer,
 Vch prynce, vche prest & prelates alle,
 Alle faste frely for her falce werkes;
 Seses childer of her sok, soghe hem so neuer,
 Ne best bite on no brom, ne no bent nauther,
 Passe to no pasture, ne pike non erbes,
 Ne non oxe to no hay, ne no horse to water;
 Al schal crye for-clemmed, with alle oure clere strenthe,
 The rurd schal ryse to hym that rawthe schal haue;
 What wote other wyte may gif the wyge lykes,
 That is hende in the hygt of his gentryse?
 I wot his mygt is so much, thats he be mysse-payed,
 That in his mylde amesyng he mercy may fynde;
 & if we leuen the layk of oure layth synnes,
 & styлле steepen in the styge he stygtles hym seluen,
 He wyl wende of his wodschip, & his wrath leue,
 & forgif *us* this gult gif we hym god leuen."

These two passages will suffice to shew the expressiveness of our language at the remote period in which they were written.

We will now turn to Hampole's *Pricke of Conscience*, which we have before considered at some length, giving some specimens of translations from it; so that there is less need of our spending much time over it on the present occasion. Scattered over the work from beginning to end are translations of brief portions of Scripture from Job, from the Psalms, from the Prophets, and from the New Testament. A few of these only will fully answer our purpose. St. Matt. xxiv. 3—12, is thus rendered:—

"'Says us,' cryed thai, 'of thi commyng
 Som taken and of the world endyng.
 Crist als tite answerd tham than,
 And sayd lukes that yhow desayve na man,
 For many sal com in my name,
 That sal say thus, 'Crist I am.'
 And many a man thai sal bygile
 Bot thai sal regne here bot a while;
 And rewme ogayne rewme, on the same wyse
 Men ogayne men, thurgh strength sal ryse;

Pestilences and hungers sal be,
 And erthedyns in many contré.
 And al this sal be bygynnyng hard
 Of the sorows that sal com aftirward;
 Wykkednesse sal wax many falde,
 And charité of many sal wax calde."

Another example of this author's translations may fitly follow here; it is St. Luke xxi. 25—27 :—

"Takens sal be in the son and in the mone,
 And in the sternes that in heuen may ken,
 And in erthe sal be grete thrang of men,
 For the mengyng of the noys of the se
 Of the flodes, that than sal be;
 And men sal wax dry in that dyn
 For drede and for lang bydyng thar-in,
 That til al the world sal cum,' says he,
 'For the myghtes of heuen sal than styrd be,
 And thai sal se the son of man
 Comand down in cloudes than,
 With his grete myght and magesté.' "

The well-known passage in Joel (ii. 30, 31) follows immediately after the passage given above :—

"I sal gyfe wonders sere
 Up in heven, als men sal here;
 And takens down in erthe ere-on to luke,
 That es blode and fire and brethe of smoke;
 The son sal be turned in-til mirknes,
 And the mone in-til blode, and be lyghtles,
 Byfor or the day of our lord sal falle,
 That sal be grete and openly shewed til alle."

With one other example we must pass from Hampole: it is to be found in St. Luke xvii. 26—30 :—

"Thir er the wordes of the godspelle,
 That es on Inglissche thus to telle:
 'Als was done in the days of Noé,
 Ryght swa mans son sal com,' says he,
 'Men ete and drank than and war glade,
 And wedded wyfes, and bridalles made
 Until the day, namly, that Noé
 Went in-to the shippe that made he,
 And sodanly come the flode that tyde
 And fordid alle the world swa wyde.
 Alswa in the days of Loth byfelle,
 Men ete and drank, shortly to telle,

Ilkan with other, and salde and boght,
 And planted, and bygged, and houses wrought,
 And that day that Loth yhed out of Sodome
 Sodaynly Goddes vengeance come;
 It rayned fire fra heven and brunstane,
 And tynt al that thare was, and spard nane,
 Right thus sal falle, als men sal se,
 The day man son sal shewed be.' "

In this and preceding notices on *Early English Poetry* we have made frequent use of Wiclif's name, and may, perhaps, therefore fitly close this article with some few extracts from his translation of the Scriptures. Thanks to Dr. Bosworth and Mr. Waring, Wiclif's translation of the Gospels is placed within the reach of many readers who might otherwise have been debarred from its use.* The passages we propose to quote from Wiclif are the same as those quoted above from Hampole; but it will be necessary for the reader to bear in mind that while Hampole's can hardly, in justice, be styled anything but paraphrases in rhyme, Wiclif's are translations, both being made from the Latin Vulgate. St. Matthew xxiv. 3—12 is thus rendered by Wiclif. "Tell vs, when this shalbe, and what signe shalbe of thy comminge, and of the ende of the worlde. And Jesus answered and sayde vnto them, Take hede, that no man desceave you. Many schulen come in my name, seyynge, I am Crist; and thei schulen disceyue manye. Sothly ye ben to heere bateyls, and opynyouns of bateyls; se ye, that ye ben not distroblid; forsoth it bihoueth thes thingis to be don, but not yit is the ende. Folk schal ryse to gidere agen folk, and rewme in to rewme, and pestilencis, and hungiris, and erthemouyngis schulen be by placis; forsothe alle thes thingis ben bigynnyngis of sorwis And for wickidnesse schal be plenteous, the charite of manye schal wexe coold." St. Luke xxi. 25—27 is translated as follows: "And tokenes schulen be in the sunne, and moone, and sterris; and in the erthe *schal be* ouerleying of folkis, for confusioun of sown of the see that and wawis; men waxinge drye for drede and abidinge that schulen come on al the world; forwhi vertues of heuene schulen be mouyd. And thanne thei schulen se mannis sone

* The Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels in parallel columns, with the versions of Wiclif and Tyndale; arranged, with Preface and Notes, by the Rev. Joseph Bosworth, D.D., etc., etc., assisted by George Waring, Esq., M.A. London, 1865. A very valuable book, and one which we hope to see in the hands of all who wish to know what changes our language has undergone during the last nine hundred years. These changes may easily be traced in the volume before us from King Alfred to Wiclif, from Wiclif to Tyndale, and so on to our authorized version of the Scriptures.

comynge in a cloude, with greet power and maieste." And St. Luke xvii. 26—30 thus: "And as it was don in the dayes of Noe, so it schal be in the dayes of mannis sone. Thei eeten and drunken, and weddiden wyues, and weren gownn to weddingis, til in to the day in which Noe entride in to his schip; and the greet flood cam, and loste alle. Also as it was don in the dayes of Loth, thei eeten and drunken, boughten and seelden, plantiden and byldeden; sothli in what day Loth wente out of Sodom, the Lord reynede fier and brymstoon fro heuene, and loste alle. Vp this thing it schal be, in what day mannis sone schal be schewid."

J. M. C.

Discoveries at Ephesus.—Yesterday, being at Azizieh, I had some finds worth noticing. First I examined the conical hill near Azizieh, beyond the Ephesus Pass. This, as I suspected, I found to be a tomb; and it proves to be one of the remarkable monuments of Asia Minor. It is a conical hill about 600 or 700 feet high, but joining on to a low ridge behind. It is so unlike the neighbouring formations of limestone that I suspect it has been trimmed partially. This mound, about 150 feet below the summit, is crowned with a ring wall of loose rubble piled about ten feet wide on the surface, and which is mostly in good preservation. On the top is the tumulus, in a very dilapidated state, having been rifled, and in a worse state than the tomb of Tantalus on Sipylus. There are appearances of the inner vault, and, like that of Tantalus, there are many bits of tiles of the same kind, and so likewise in the wall and scattered over the mound. To designate this, I propose to call it the Tomb of Lydus. At the foot to the east, close against the tomb, I found the site of a small town, about 1,000 feet square, evidently on the old road to the interior. I then went with Mr. E. A. Drew to see the pass he has brought to light, and which is the real Ephesus Pass, about one mile or one mile and a-half to the right of the present Ephesus Pass, through which the railway passes to Azizieh. The original and deserted pass is a very interesting site. Here I identified the site of a large town or city, which must have had upwards of 20,000 inhabitants. For a mile and a-half or two miles the surface is thickly filled with tiles and stones, interspersed with foundations and heaps of stones. The only sculptured remains are at the lower part, near Azizieh, where there is a small but solid building, with a niche and two windows. In the tombs are two double pilasters of very poor style. This place I have named Eski Azizieh. I cannot conjecture its ancient designation. It was evidently the summer town or village of Ephesus, and I consider Latorea was at Boorgas, close by. There are considerable remains of the causeway, but the place must have been deserted for many centuries. The pass leading to Azizieh is well supplied with water; but then below Eski Azizieh is a good stream most of the way from Magnesia ad Mæandrum. I consider Eski Azizieh a promising site for excavations. All the places I have referred to are within a short walk of Azizieh, and Eski Azizieh is about five miles from Ephesus station.—HYDE CLARKE.—*Athenæum*.

CORRESPONDENCE ON LEV. XI. 3—7, AND DEUT. XIV. 6—8.*

MR. GILLESPIE having waited upon Mr. Young, to bring before him the passages Leviticus xi. 3—7, and Deuteronomy xiv. 6—8, in combination with 1 Kings vii. 9, Mr. Young writes as follows, and the correspondence goes on:—

No. 1.—MR. YOUNG to MR. GILLESPIE.

My dear Sir,—I have examined every one of the ten passages where the word *לִיָּד* occurs, comparing them with the ancient versions, the Septuagint, the Chaldee Targum, the Syriac Peshito, the Samaritan Version, the Latin Vulgate, and the Arabic. If you could kindly favour me with your question in writing, I shall try and give as distinct an answer as possible.—Yours, etc.
Edinburgh, June 28, 1865.

No. 2.—MR. GILLESPIE to MR. YOUNG.

My dear Sir,—I have received your kind note of yesterday, and I shall endeavour to put my question in the briefest form, divested of every extrinsic consideration.

Is it the case that the writer in Leviticus xi. and Deuteronomy xiv. asserts that the hare does chew the cud? that is, does the writer imply that the animal has the stomach and habits of a ruminant? or, on the other hand, does the writer really allege no more than this, that the hare brings forward and chews, that is, saws or grinds its food? In other words, did not King James's translators take a meaning to the Hebrew, in place of taking one from it? And is it not corroborative of such a supposition, that, although the phraseology in the Hebrew varies considerably, those translators keep by the one phrase, whatever the phraseology of the original?

Such is my question, eliminated in the meantime from all external considerations. These possibly may come into the field afterwards.—Yours, etc.

P.S. Possibly you may come to the conclusion that the phrase made by the two Hebrew words occurring so often may be translated *set on the saw, or sawing process*. If so, the passages in Leviticus and Deuteronomy could be translated in harmony with the passage in 1 Kings vii. 9.

Edinburgh, June 29, 1865.

* Between Messrs. William Honyman Gillespie and Robert Young and the Author of a *Popular Appeal*, etc. As prepared for publication by Mr. Gillespie.

No. 3.—Mr. YOUNG to Mr. GILLESPIE.

My dear Sir,—I regret much that I have been unavoidably prevented till now from writing you, as I promised, regarding the phrase, “Chewing the cud,” as found in Lev. xi. 3—7, and Deut. xiv. 6—8. The original word, which in these passages is translated “cud,” is גָּרָה, which is derived from a root, גָּרָה or גָּרַר or גָּרַר, the primary signification of which is almost, if not altogether, uniformly admitted by lexicographers to be “to drag or draw along, or up, or backwards and forwards,” like most Hebrew words having גָּר in the first syllable. Other derivatives are מָגָרָה, a “saw,” because “drawn” along, and הִגָּרָה “strife, contention.” The most natural meaning, therefore, of גָּרָה is a “thing dragged” along, backwards and forwards, etc.

The Hebrew verb translated “*chew*”^b is literally derived from a root, signifying to “bring up, cause to ascend, come, or go up.” It may be rendered “to bring *forward*,” though “*up*” is the more natural meaning. It occurs 2 Ch. xx. 34, where it is translated “mentioned;” but evidently “brought up or forward” is the primitive idea. Literally, then, the combined phrase is, “bringing up or forward (the thing dragged, or) the drag,” whatever that may be. In Lev. xi. 7, and in Deut. xiv. 8, there is a slight change in the form of the expression. In the former there is a change of the verb, which is not the same as that rendered “to bring up or forward,” but is one derived from, or connected with, the noun גָּרָה itself, and must evidently have the same general meaning. Literally, then, this phrase is, “and the drag (or dragged thing) it does not drag.” In Deut. xiv. 8, where the common English version reads “yet cheweth not the cud,” the Hebrew text has no verb at all, and is simply, “and not the drag or dragged thing.”^c

If, passing from the philological, we turn to the historical, meaning of the phrase, we find that the authors of the Septuagint version (B.C. 280) have uniformly rendered it by ἀναγούσι μηρυκισμὸν; the Chaldee Targum of Onkelos (B.C. 50 to A.D. 100) renders it מִסְקָא פִּשְׁרָא; the Peshito-Syriac (A.D. 100-150) renders it מִסְקָא פִּשְׁרָא; the Samaritan version (A.D. 150-200) renders it מִסְקָא גָּרָה; the Latin Vulgate version of Jerome (A.D. 400) renders it “*rumino*,” the Arabic version of Saadias Gaon is too recent to be of much authority, but it

^b See letter, No. 10.—W. H. G.^c *Ibid.*

agrees with all the above-mentioned versions in rendering it "bringing up or forward the drag, or dragged thing," i.e., the cud.

I regret I cannot at present throw any additional light upon the meaning of the phrase. I fear it is impossible to uphold the translation you mention, "to set on the sawing process;" and if it were, I am inclined to think the meaning would not be materially different from the commonly understood meaning of the phrase, "chewing the cud."

The questions at issue, Whether the hare does or does not chew the cud, and whether Moses asserts or does not assert it as a fact, do not, it appears to me, trench upon the authority of Scripture as a Divine record of duty. Every wise teacher adapts his instructions to the capacity of his pupils. He uses the language of common life without rigidly scrutinizing its positive accuracy. Hence he speaks of the sun rising and setting, of the birds of the air carrying tidings, of the lion being strongest among beasts, of the eagle plucking out the eye of a disobedient child, of its reviving its youth, of the everlasting mountains, of Beelzebub casting out demons, of thunder being the voice of God, etc. The design of Revelation is not to teach the physical sciences, but man's duty to his fellow-man, and to God Himself. This duty is either natural or positive; the former cannot change, but the latter may. Hence the two must be distinguished: this may sometimes not be easy, but there is no alternative, no infallible criterion, and we are bound to investigate for ourselves as accountable beings. God's Revelations are all progressive, implying previous incompleteness in each. The former are only binding as explained, or modified, or enlarged, by the latter. I dread greatly lest Christian apologists or expositors should bind, or attempt to bind, a certain interpretation of Scripture to the hearty reception of it as a Revelation of God's will in "many parts," and in "many ways," made to us and to our fathers.—Yours, etc.

P.S. You are welcome to use this in any way.

Peebles, July 4, 1865.

No. 4.—Mr. GILLESPIE to Mr. YOUNG.

My dear Sir,—Yours of the 4th current I perused with pleasure and satisfaction; with pleasure, because you seem to enter so heartily into the spirit of the enquiry; with satisfaction, because we—unless I mistake the matter very much—sail in the same boat, though we are not pulling at the same individual oar.

From the detail you give, it appears (and previously I had no doubt on the subject,) that to draw or drag backwards and forwards,—of which sawing is one of the kinds,—is the radical meaning of the Hebrew verb גָּרַר (*Garar*, or, with your leave, *Gar*.) [Has not this latter form a representative in a braid Scotch verb? In *ex. gr.*,—*He GAUR'D me greet*.] About the other Hebrew word, (עָלָה from מַעְלָה,) there is, and there can be, no substantial diversity of opinion.

Grinding, then, sawing with the teeth, chewing with the grinders, as graminivorous quadrupeds chew, and must chew, their grassy food, is the meaning of the Hebrew verb which occurs in so many letters, or latently as root, in our passages in the Pentateuch. The noun, whether in one form or another, whether as גֵּרָה in Leviticus xi. and Deuteronomy xiv., or as מַגְרָה in 1 Kings vii. 9, must have a meaning in analogy with the meaning of the relative verb. The *gerah*, then, or *m'gerah* means, or may mean, a saw, or the process of sawing; when spoken of in reference to food, it means chewing, by grinding, or by continued mastication of the blades of grass. I think, for all this, I have substantial evidence in your valuable detail.

And now for my real question. For your detail, or the philological investigation, does no more than prepare the way for the grand question at issue. I find in my English Dictionaries that the word *cud* is "the food which ruminating animals return from the first stomach, into the mouth, to chew again." The word *cud*, therefore, relates to at least two stomachs, while to *chew the cud* refers to something brought from the first stomach to be returned into the second. Now I ask, has Moses (supposing Moses is the author of Leviticus and Deuteronomy), has Moses, I say, one word that relates to two stomachs? Has he one word which involves anatomical knowledge on the part of his audience, or readers? Does he treat of the nature of the stomach of a ruminant, as distinguished from the structure of a non-ruminant animal? To these questions I emphatically answer—No. And I invite you to follow my course, and do the same.

The writer of our passages (and, for the present, I do not care who he was,) is, or personates, a lawgiver,—a lawgiver writing for a people, not many years before escaped from the degradation of a two, or three, or four, hundred years' subjection to debasing slavery—slaves in the land of enemies, or men who had come to be their determined enemies. The writer, therefore, is represented as having a mass of men in his eye, who

could not be supposed ready to view things scientifically, or according to inner knowledges and mysteries. He must address himself to men who, by the simple exercise of their five senses, could tell their right hand from their left,—could tell, not indeed, whether an animal, on dissection, reveals one, two, or more stomachs; but whether an animal, which they were, or were not, to cook for their dinner, chewed deliberately, as tame cattle in general do, and as the camel, and the hare also do, as opposed to the non-sawing, or non-grinding process by which a swine, or sow, swallowed or bolted its food. That was the distinction to which the lawgiver, or his simulator, must evidently refer, and any Israelite, not affected from his birth with incurable eye-disease (in a country abounding with every species of *ophthalmia*), could tell whether a quadruped bolted or swallowed its food wholesale, like the unclean pig—unclean not only ceremonially, but, I am sorry to add, in every other sense also; or whether, like a dainty ox, it will eat one sort of grass, and reject another kind, leaving several species to the asses, and geese that were to come after it.

With much which is in the second part of your letter I quite agree. Men in all ages must speak the language of phenomena or appearances; even philosophers cannot speak, in their every day intercourse, esoterically, or according to language which the deepest science would vouch for as expressing the truest scientific meaning. Sir Isaac Newton, to the day of his death, must have spoken of sunrise and sunset. But this hardly travels in the direction of the real difficulty. The question is, not whether men of science must descend from their stilts when they ask Jenny to put the kettle on, but whether men of science, or men of nescience, men of wit, or men without wits, men whether philosophers or not, and, I may add, whether inspired or uninspired; the question, I repeat, is not whether all sorts and conditions of men must alike speak the common language, the language of everyday life. But the question radically is, must a man speak either according to the inner truth of things, or esoterically? or according to the outer appearance of things, or exoterically? I say he must. No excuse can be found for a speaker or writer contradicting both the facts of science and the truth as embodied in common language, at one and the same time. To come to the point: if Moses should assert, or assent to what implies, that a hare has two stomachs—that it regurgitates its food, passing the partially-chewed grass up from the first or outer stomach into the mouth, to be chewed at leisure and afterwards passed on to the second or inner stomach, there to undergo the next process of chymification, etc., etc.—if, I say,

Moses (for this heterodox Bishop of Natal) asserted that the hare did so, your shield, so ample, and constructed with the most generous intentions, would be quite insufficient to protect Moses from the sharp darts of this dreadful and troublesome Colenso. I think you will see this clearly. Your principle—even in the case of a man who admitted it to the full—does not extend to such a case as that in hand. Fairbairn's way of it (though in reality he does not honestly look the difficulty in the face) would be nearer the mark than you are. All philosophers and great poets, whether inspired like a Homer, a Virgil, a Dante, or a Shakespeare, or inspired by that still greater inspiration possessed by a Moses (who was a very great poet if he only wrote the songs attributed to him), or an Isaiah—an Ezekiel, or a St. John;—all philosophers and all poets must keep within a certain distance of truthful representation. They cannot be allowed to assert what is false exoterically and esoterically, and in every way that the wit of man can put it. Nay, I would go farther, and maintain that, if no ordinary philosopher or poet could dare to state what was false in every sense, much less could an extraordinary philosopher and poet, all in one, by virtue of his claim to a higher inspiration, venture to vend sheer falsities, which both the investigations of science and the experience of everyday life would combine to pronounce falsities, if not sheer fatuities.

Edinburgh, 10th July, 1865.

P.S.—31st July, 1865.—The preceding has lain by me since the 10th inst. Since it was written several Scotch songs have been pointed out to me as containing the word referred to in my second paragraph, and, which is surprising, the word is spelt exactly as the Hebrew verb is, *i.e.*, not “gaur” (as I have it), but *gar*.

No. 5.—MR. YOUNG to MR. GILLESPIE.

My dear Sir,—Your lengthened communication of July 10th—31st reached me in due course. . . .

I cannot at all see how גָּרָה גָּרָה in Lev. xi. 7, can mean anything but “to drag, or draw along the drag,” or that מַעֲלֶה גָּרָה, “to bring up the drag,” can mean anything different from the idea of “chewing the cud,” expressed in all the ancient versions. Your own idea of “sawing the sawn” food appears equivalent to “chewing the cud,” totally irrespective of the question whether Moses or the Bible says anything about animals having two stomachs, or whether the Jews

had any accurate knowledge of anatomy. *Three* animals are mentioned as doing a certain thing; two of them, undoubtedly, do this very thing, the third does not.⁴ It follows, as a matter of course, that (if the text be *uncorrupted*) the author spake either agreeably to common opinion, or was himself mistaken. I think the first the most probable, and the fact that such a man as Cowper was under the same impression, while daily observing the animal in question, shews there is some foundation for the popular theory. I am also of opinion that the knowledge of the sciences among the ancient Hebrews, even when in Egypt, was much beyond what is generally recognized. I believe their oppression lasted only a comparatively *short* time, that they were all the time under their own officers and judges, and that—save only in the matter of the *forced levy* of men for the brick kilns, and the *attempted* murder of the children—they were as happy as the Egyptians themselves.

I cannot at all see how גָּרָה can mean “the *process* of sawing or chewing;” it can only mean, I think, the thing sawn or chewed. I have no particular objection to translating it, “grinding the ground thing, chewing the chewn, sawing the sawn thing;” but I see strong objections to rendering it, as you do, “grinding with the grinders.” In this case we would most naturally expect גָּרָה to be in the plural גָּרוֹת, which never occurs, *e.g.*, גָּרָה בְּגָרוֹת. Besides, “to bring up the grinders” would be nonsense.

It would have afforded me much pleasure if I had been able to concur in your proposed solution of the (supposed) difficulty, but my critical conscience forbids me, and I have such a thorough conviction of the value of a *philological-historical* testimony that it overbears every other consideration in determining the meaning of a Scripture phrase. By far the great majority of Colenso's objections have been *familiar* to Jewish and Christian expositors and to the ancient enemies of Christianity, and they have been easily answered by a reference to the original text and the ancient versions, etc.; but the objection regarding the *hare* seems a *new* one, not known to the ancients, so far as I have observed in my reading. Had it been founded on a mere mistranslation of the Hebrew text, as you suppose, no doubt it would have been noticed and treated of; but the fact that it is not noticed leads me to believe that the

⁴ One of the animals—*i.e.*, the camel—does chew the cud undoubtedly; *shaphan* is a doubtful name, the beast being doubtful; and the third case, to wit, that of the *hare*, is the *de quo queritur*.—W. H. G.

translation is correct, and the solution must be sought in another direction. Wishing you every success in elucidating Scripture, believe me to remain.—Yours, etc.

Edinburgh, October 9, 1865.

No. 6.—Mr. GILLESPIE to Mr. YOUNG.

Dear Sir,—An observer looking at a mountain when near its base does not see its size and proportions so well as a person who is removed to a considerable distance. That I might have the benefit of this law in the observation of masses, I have not been looking at the mountain since the receipt of your last letter, dated Oct. 9.

In fine, I mean to jot down one or two things which came uppermost in reflecting upon our correspondence. I shall not promise more than some remarks, which may not be connected like links in a chain, but they shall all have relation to the one subject, nevertheless.

Is it now very plain that—taking for granted that Moses, as a legislator, wrote the passages—Moses has not a word referring to the topic of *how many stomachs*: he never intended to say a word to his countrymen about the internal anatomy of the hare, or any other of the unclean beasts, whom he specially excludes. As a wise legislator writing laws for unscientific (who, as their history shews, were also often hungry) citizens, he did not dream of going beyond their depth when settling such a home question as how to fill the belly. But it is equally plain that he would naturally take for his tests things visible to the senses, such as long continued chewing of a ball of grass, or grassy food.

To go a single step farther, must not every tyro in Hebrew perceive that, in the texts, there is not a term or phrase which can be tortured into a reference to one, two, or more stomachs? There is a word which indubitably means to ascend, or bring up, but which may also mean to bring forward, etc. There is another word which, without question, has been rightly translated as being concerned with *a saw*, and which must, therefore, be in other passages translated with some reference to sawing, literal or metaphorical; say, such sawing, as long continued grinding or chewing the food, as those clean, graminivorous animals did, and do grind, or chew, their food. If all this be so, Moses *does not assert* that the hare chews the cud. He asserts merely that the hare brings forward (out of its side cheek-pouches, perhaps,) its grassy mouthful, to be well—that

is, lengthily—masticated before being committed to its stomach, incapable itself of digesting blades of grass as such.

Hence the text of Moses is not at all impugned by the sagacious discovery by modern naturalists, that the hare has only the stomach of a rodent; that, consequently, it has not the stomach of a ruminant; that, in short, it has not two or more stomachs, like the cow.

But take the phrase, *to chew the cud*, in a wide sense—holding that cud means merely a ball of grass, without considering whether the mouth the ball is in be the mouth of an animal with one stomach or with a variety of stomachs—if, I say, one held this to be the meaning of the phrase, then the most strict maintainer of verbal inspiration need not object to allow that Moses alleged that the hare did chew the cud. These are things that occur to me in reflecting upon one department of our correspondence; but there is another topic on which I would say a word.

The more I consider the subject, the more do I become satisfied that it will never do to suppose that he is the infallible depositary of heavenly secrets, who errs and goes astray in the saddest manner about the common-place and earthly matters. Our Master says, according to an Evangelist, “If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?” Could not we accommodate this passage to our present purpose, and bring forth this proposition for use?—*If I, Moses, have told you of earthly matters, within the reach of your faculties, and therein have proved to be a sorry bungler, how should ye believe me if I tell you of recondite mysteries in the heavens?* If I err, as to the bodily functions of the common hare, in giving you laws as to what you are to eat, and not to eat, how shall you believe me when I pretend to give you the archetypes of things as they are in the heavens of God?

I have noted, for a good while, that many defenders of revelation seem to argue in this fashion. The more ignorant and erring a man is as to matters of human science, and matters of fact of an earthly kind in general, so much the fitter is he to become the organ of spiritual and heavenly oracles. Palpably, the very reverse ought to be the rule; and the man who in matters of fact and human science proves himself a block-head, or, to borrow the language of the great authority, Dogberry, writes himself down ass, plenarily evidences that he is incompetent for the task of teaching occult heavenly truths. If a man mistakes matters so much as to count erroneously how many teeth his own veritable donkey has, in order that, *quà* philosopher; he may lay down the dental law for the large ass

family, how shall he be able to cause us to have faith in him as a revealer of such a mystery as the pre-existent humanity of the Logos, the eternal archetype of universal man?

The truth of the matter is that the common sense of mankind will always rebel against that species of teachers. It has been said (and I fancy truly said) that no one was ever a hero to his *valet de chambre*, just because the valet must have observed how his master coughed, and how he spat. The valet, perceiving that his lord is as common a man as he is in many of the ordinary offices of life, infers that his lord can be nothing greater—cannot be a hero at all. Therein the valet is wrong; he draws a conclusion not warranted by his premises. But, for all that, there is an element of truth in his reasoning. His lord, he has found, is a genuine man; his daily necessities prove that; prove moreover that he cannot be raised entirely above the level of humanity. And thus the writer, who is human in his earthly manifestations, cannot be allowed to be altogether above the plane of humanity in his heavenly connections. It is more easy to err here than there; it is more difficult to be right in the heavenly revelation than in the earthly report.

I hope that you will take my observations in quite good part; that you will allow them their due weight, and that, should you incline more than hitherto to my side with regard to any of the topics which have been controverted between us, you will give me the satisfaction of knowing that it is so.—I remain, etc.

Edinburgh, December 30, 1865.

No. 7.—MR. YOUNG to MR. GILLESPIE.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of the 30th ult. came safely to hand. I have read it with attention, and hasten to acknowledge it before a pressure of other duties push it aside.

The line of thought it is based on, viz., that if a messenger of God is not trustworthy in "earthly things," he cannot be so in "heavenly ones," rather belongs to the *theologian* than to the *verbal critic*, whose province is the *meaning* of words, not their *truth* or *consistency*. The only philological remark, therefore, that occurs to me to make on your communication is, that I doubt very much the propriety of rendering *הָבִיאוּ*, "bringing forward," instead of "bringing up." Until some very distinct passage can be brought forward to support the new meaning, the old one appears the only true one.

I suspect a good deal of the apparent difficulty arises

from a misunderstanding of the expression, "all (or every) Scripture is God-breathed."^e

Edinburgh, January 3, 1866.

No. 8.—Mr. GILLESPIE to Mr. YOUNG.

My dear Sir,—I was favoured with yours of 3rd inst., and I beg leave to express my sense of your goodness in writing me so fully with the view of implanting in me more correct ideas of the nature of true inspiration. I am sorry that, after every consideration, your sentiments appear in my humble opinion to want internal coherence and consistency with each other, and to labour under a radical defect. But it is not on the subject of inspiration, whether according to your way or not, that I mean to address you at present.

You do not say anything against my view of the word גר (גר), or גרר, and its cognates. I take for granted that you allow the radical truth of what I have urged on this topic. With regard to the other word, מעלה, you think I am wrong, and you throw down a challenge to me to support my view by a single distinct passage. Your words are: "Until some very distinct passage can be brought forward to support the new meaning, the old one appears the only true one." That is to say (as I understand) you allege that "to bring up," i.e., the cud, is the only true meaning: "to bring forward," cannot be admitted. In short, any other meaning than bringing up cannot be given to the verb עלה. I accept the challenge and proceed to give you a passage justifying me. You only ask one passage, and at present I shall give you none other; and, indeed, the one passage will be found to be sufficient.

If you turn to the thirty-sixth chapter of Job, and 20th verse, you will find (in English version) these words, "Desire not the night, when people are cut off in their place." If next you turn to the original, you will perceive that the word in question, in one phase, makes its appearance. Our translators have translated it, as in that verse, "cut off," and will you pretend to say that they translated wrongly? Could you attach any idea of physical elevation, or going up, to the term as it appears in this passage? You could not. We have an English phrase to express the idea, and our English phrase is, "struck down." We say, such a man was suddenly *struck down* in the night-

^e The writer proceeds to unfold his views as to the inspiration of Scripture. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Young marked the rest of the letter as "*private*." Mr. Young concludes his letter with a fine sentiment. "If (he writes) we could divest ourselves of prejudices, we might discuss the deep things of God without receiving one unholy impression, but on the contrary, *light* and *love*."

time by such a sudden irruption of disease as had immediate death in the train. As, then, you wished a passage in which a meaning other than bringing up is the meaning which must be attached to the term; you have got one, and I hope you will be clearly satisfied with the "very distinct passage."

Why, the cognate word עָלָה stands for a *leaf*, because, alleges Gesenius (no mean authority), leaves *grow forth*. It is not the province of lexicographers to observe trees, and yet we see Gesenius had not failed to observe that leaves extend beyond each other laterally or horizontally, as well as (in other cases) they rise above each other vertically. But enough on this subject. . . .—Yours, &c.

Edinburgh, January 6, 1866.

No. 9.—Mr. YOUNG to Mr. GILLESPIE.

My dear Sir,—Your favour of yesterday's date has come to hand. I cannot think that עָלָה in Job xxxvi. 20, can by any possibility be translated "*cut off*," as in the common version. I have no doubt but that the real meaning of the phrase is as I have rendered it (in my *second* edition of the New Translation), viz., "for the going up of peoples in their stead," or "instead of them," i.e., the wicked and profane. The LXX. has τοῦ ἀναβῆναι λαοὺς ἀντ' αὐτῶν; Vulgate, "*ut ascendant populi pro eis*." So in the case of עָלָה a "*leaf*," it derives its name from the idea of *rising, ascending*, and not from that of *spreading*, for which there is an appropriate word in the Hebrew. I cannot but think every system of interpretation false that rests on a strained, uncommon, meaning that may be forced on a word of every-day occurrence, the general meaning of which is as clear as noon. עָלָה as a verb occurs above 800 times in the Old Testament, and there is no difference whatever among lexicographers as to its meaning, so far as I know. I must, therefore, still desiderate a single instance where "*bringing forward*," as distinguished from *bringing up*; is its meaning.—Yours, &c.

P.S. Had Moses chosen he might have used הוֹצִיָה he brought forth, forward, out, the הוֹצִיָה.

Edinburgh, January 7, 1866.

No. 10.—Mr. GILLESPIE to Mr. YOUNG.

My dear Sir,—I sit down to acknowledge receipt of yours of 7th inst., and to make very brief reply thereto.

You asked me to give you a single instance in which a mean-

ing, other than “to bring up,” is the real meaning of the Hebrew verb, ^{עלה}עלה. I gave you an instance, which I thought was a decisive one. In it the verb in question occurs, our translators having translated it to “cut off.” You allege that translation is altogether incorrect. I maintained that, in the passage in Job alluded to, the idea of bringing up, or physical elevation, is out of the question. In reply, you treat me to the corresponding place in sacred Scripture, as it is in LXX. and in the Vulgate. Here I am willing to allow the philological controversy, as to the term ^{עלה}עלה, to drop.

In yours before me, you say that “there is no difference whatever among lexicographers,” as to the meaning of the verb ^{עלה}עלה, though, I admit, you add the saving words, “so far as I know.” Your next sentence runs: “I must, therefore, still desiderate a single instance where ‘bringing forward,’ as distinguished from *bringing up*, is its meaning.” It is well that you annexed the saving clause, “so far as I know,” since I am going to bring against you, not a lexicographer, indeed, but a maker of a New Translation of the Hebrew Original, with whom you are on the very best possible terms; for, to quote St. Paul (it is important to have an Apostle on one’s side), *No man ever yet hated himself*. In fine, in your letter addressed to me, of date 4th July last, the letter, this, of which you say, *I am welcome to use it in any way*, the following passages occur:—“The Hebrew verb translated ‘*chew*’”—[there is some confusion here, philologically speaking]—“is literally derived from a root signifying to ‘bring up,’ ‘cause to ascend, come, or go up.’ It may be rendered ‘to bring forward,’ though ‘up’ is the more natural meaning. It occurs in 2 Ch. xx. 34, where it is translated ‘mentioned,’ but evidently ‘brought up or forward,’ is the primitive idea. Literally, then, the combined phrase is, ‘bringing up, or forward (the thing dragged or) the drag,’ whatever that may be.” The next paragraph, in yours of 4th July, gives a linguistic detail as to versions, and ends thus: “The Arabic version of Saadiah Gaon is too recent to be of much authority, but it agrees with all the above-mentioned versions in rendering it ‘bringing up OR FORWARD the drag or dragged thing,’ *i.e.*, the cud.”

I may have a remark or two *in retentis*, but for the present I shall say no more, but that I can assure you I am grateful for the trouble you have taken in aiding me in my inquiry, Did Moses mistake the matter, and give poor puss one, two, or more stomachs too many; converting, thus, this irritable and swift-footed rodent into a contented and sluggish ruminant?—Yours, etc.

Edinburgh, 12th January, 1866.

No. 11.—MR. JOHNSTONE to MR. GILLESPIE.

The aid of another Edinburgh Hebraist (James Johnstone, Esq.), the author of the *Popular Appeal in favour of a New Version*, having been called in, the learned linguist referred to wrote as follows:—

Dear Sir,—As requested, I now reply about the correspondence between Mr. Young and you. Soon after it came to hand, I examined the Hebrew passages bearing on the subject discussed; and, after much research, I find it useless to remark on the Hebrew, until the following matters have been investigated.

1. On turning to Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Taylor, I find under the word Hare, "Interpreters are divided concerning the signification of the Hebrew word *arnebeth*; but they agree that it signifies a hare of some kind." Mr. Taylor adds, "[Query, Whether any kind of hare, or any creature allied to it in form, etc., which might be the *arnebeth* of the Hebrews, chews the cud?]" I am not at all satisfied that the *arnebeth* of Scripture is the animal we call a hare.

2. If the *arnebeth* is the hare, then, before it is possible to compare the Hebrew description with the animal, we require to get more information regarding the action of its mouth, or rather the purpose of the action of its mouth. Cowper asserts that its jaws are in motion all day, and believed that it was chewing. On the other hand, Colenso, in vol. iii., page 481, quotes the opinion of Mr. Bartlett, the superintendent of the Royal Zoological Gardens, London, whose statement corroborates Cowper's, in that the muscles of the hare's mouth are "in almost constant motion," as if it were chewing; but Mr. Bartlett alleges that it is not chewing. Now the question should, in the first place, be determined: for what purpose is the hare's mouth in almost constant motion? Perhaps you will get this question settled, and then it will be time enough to revert back to the Hebrew. In the meantime I return you the correspondence, and I remain, yours, etc.

Edinburgh, 5th March, 1866.

No. 12.—MR. GILLESPIE to MR. JOHNSTONE.

Dear Sir,—I was favoured with yours of the 5th instant, returning me the correspondence between Mr. Robert Young and me.

You are not satisfied that "*arnebeth*" signifies a hare. This piece of negative knowledge you attained (I am bound to say) as the result of *much research*. But you also think that it would be worth while to determine, "in the first place," why the jaws

are in constant motion in the case of the common hare—an animal, indeed, spread over a considerable part of the Western hemisphere, as well as a certain portion of the Eastern.

Now, I think these things do not hang well together. Unless one were quite satisfied that the Hebrew noun (אַרְנֶבֶת) denoted a hare, what were the use of instituting an inquiry concerning the continuous movement of the muscles of the hare's mouth? If there is no hare at all in the case, would not inquiry into the operation of its jaws be about as wise a question as an interrogation concerning the fruitfulness of last year's mares' nests? In a word, take your way of it, that there is no evidence of a hare at all, and the subject-matter of the whole investigation, by heterodox and by orthodox, vanishes. The *datum* has sunk out of sight, and the less said about it for the future the better.

Gesenius is an infinitely superior authority to Calmet, even when aided by Taylor, and Gesenius, who refers to the learned Bochart as an authority, has not a single doubt that אַרְנֶבֶת stands for a hare. And this great Hebrew scholar alludes to the circumstance that 'tis the same in the Arabic and Syriac languages.

A doubt as to what the Hebrew term stood for never entered my mind. And this being so, some considerable time since I waited, in company with a friend, upon Mr. Bartlett, of the Zoological Gardens, London. My object was to get some information from him concerning the natural history facts, vouched by him, as given by the Bishop of Natal in his book. I desired, also, to put some questions to Mr. Bartlett. Unfortunately, however, I missed my man, who was down at the Indian docks to receive a cargo of fresh wild beasts, among which were (if I recollect rightly) some interesting snakes. No doubt, I can correspond with the gentleman, and it is possible that I may do so; my *point d'appui* being, that Moses does, indeed, treat of a hare, whether or no he makes a ruminant of this wild animal. —Yours, etc.

Edinburgh, 9th March, 1866.

No. 18.—Mr. GILLESPIE to Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. Young was made acquainted with the *res gesta*, in a letter dated 15th March, 1866, of which the following is the concluding portion:—

Maukin^f herself has disappeared, and, at her departure from the stage, the very *fons et origo* of the controversy has evanished.

^f The Scotch for hare.

Mr. Johnstone, by a *presto!* begone! has extricated puss indeed from any further trouble, leaving commentators in helpless wonder over the nondescript that occupies her *form*.

If all persons decided controversies after the fashion of Mr. Johnstone, fewer theological and critical battles would be fought. The combatants would never approach each other, so many unheard of preliminary difficulties would be started. The combatants, of a truth, would never get a sight of each other's true swords. If you cannot do better, send the beast away about its business, and there's an end of the matter.—Yours, etc.

No. 14.—Mr. YOUNG to Mr. GILLESPIE.

My dear Sir,—Your favour of yesterday's date came safely to hand. I cannot but think the suggestion that the true meaning of אֲרֵנֶת should first be settled, is a good one, and Gesenius's authority ought not to be any bar in the way. The Septuagint do not read *λαγώς*, the usual word for a hare, but *χοιρογρύλλιον* and *δασύπους* (thick-footed), and the Vulgate of Jerome has *lepus*.

The Syriac and Arabic languages have indeed the identical Hebrew word with (I suppose, for I have not time at present to examine) the meaning of *hare* attached to it; but it must be borne in mind that the oldest writings in Syriac are of A.D. 200—300, and the oldest in Arabic of A.D. 600, *i.e.*, 1600 to 2000 years after Moses, and it is *possible* (to say the least of it) that they may have applied the word to some other animal than the one intended by Moses. . . . Yours, etc.

Edinburgh, March 16, 1866.

No. 15.—Mr. GILLESPIE to Mr. YOUNG.

My dear Sir,—Yours of 16th I received, and your renewed attention is very gratifying.

Two circumstances seem to be of themselves sufficient to decide against any search after the meaning of *Arnebeth*.

1. The Arabians have, indeed, the identical word in their vocabulary, and an Arabian knows perfectly well what he is about when he bestows on a hare the quadriliteral *Arn(a)b*. It is quite true, as you observe, that the oldest writing (of the kind you have in mind) in Arabic may be no older than A.D. 600. But what of that? That earliest writing was in reference to a spoken language—a language which, as it had been spoken for centuries before, has been spoken to this present hour. And, in the case of this living language (a providential circumstance, enabling us to decide so much concerning the dead cognate

Hebrew), it is impossible to imagine that we can disjoin the known animal from the ordinary word which the tribes of Arabia apply to it.

2. A term which occurs in the passage in Leviticus xi. and Deuteronomy xiv., has been the occasion of much inquiry and discussion among linguists and naturalists. But, while the animal meant by the Hebrew *ḥayyā*, translated in our Bibles by "coney," has been the subject of controversy, and that ever since the revival of all true learning in Europe, if not before; while, I say, the animal covered by *Shaphan* has been reckoned doubtful, the animal denoted by *Arnebeth* has been the subject of no animated debate.⁵

What I principally found fault with in the case of Mr. Johnstone was, not so much that he sought to get quit of the hare, but that, while he did seek to abolish maukin, he, very inconsistently, would have set me upon an inquiry into the reasons why maukin's mouth keeps moving. I thought the latter inquiry needless, if serious doubt was thrown upon the existence of the possessor of the mouth. A hunt after a hare—I mean a hare's mobile jaws—would have been to me as good as a wild goose chase.—Yours, etc.

Edinburgh, 19th March, 1866.

No. 16.— Mr. JOHNSTONE to Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. Johnstone having been informed, on 21st March, of the contents of the foregoing, wrote as follows :—

My dear Sir,—I duly received yours of 9th, and am now in receipt of yours of yesterday.

I have read what you have written about *Arnebeth*, meaning a hare, and it is possible that it may have been an animal something like the hare; but all that you have written will not convince me that *Arnebeth* refers to an animal which did not in some way re-chew, or chew excessively, its food;⁶ therefore, when you have determined the point, whether the hare does or does not in some fashion re-chew, or chew excessively, its food, I will be glad to hear from you.—Yours, etc.

Edinburgh, 22nd March, 1866.

⁵ For my own part (if I may venture to express an opinion), I have little doubt that the animal meant by "Shaphan" is the animal known as the Syrian *Hyrax*. See *The Intellectual Observer* for September, 1863. Kitto may also be consulted on the subject. He is certain that the animal is not a rabbit (as our translators thought), but the *Hyrax*.

⁶ Why, this very thing which Mr. Gillespie is represented to have denied, is the very thing he has been labouring to make out. He has endeavoured to shew just this: that the hare does "re-chew, or chew excessively its food."—See Letters No. 2, No. 4, and others.—W. H. G.

No. 17.—Mr. YOUNG to Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. Young called on Mr. Gillespie, and afterwards, on the 3rd April, wrote in these terms:—

I hasten to state in writing what I said verbally, viz., that I do not think that the *Chaldee*, *Arabic*, and *Syriac* translators knew the real meaning at all of the Hebrew term *Arnebeth*. It only occurs twice, and in both cases they have simply transcribed the Hebrew word into their own peculiar characters. *Freytag*, *Golius*, *Mentzki*, *Richardson*, etc., in their respective dictionaries, give simply the word with the meaning "*hare*," but they refer to *no author* in support of it. *Edward Lane*, whose life-work is now publishing in his *Arabic Dictionary*, omits the word entirely; from which I conclude that he has not met with it in *Arabic literature*, or in the language of *common life*.

Several of the above-mentioned lexicographers speak of a fish under the appellation of *arnabi bahri*, i.e., "*hare of the river or sea*," said to be a *poisonous fish*. *Arnabal* is said to be applied also to the "*ridge of the nose*."—Yours, etc.

No. 18.—Mr. GILLESPIE to Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. Gillespie rejoined on 6th April:—Dear Sir,—It would, indeed, give an entirely different aspect to the affair should it turn out that *arnebeth* is not the name for a hare in Hebrew, the same fact holding in the Arabic. The circumstance would furnish an easy solution of the infidel objection raised by various writers, and so much insisted on by Colenso. But I do not anticipate the existence of any such "*door of hope*" as such an Achor would be.

In any view, it would be highly satisfactory to learn what is the Arabic for *hare*. Could I think of any Muslim doctor on intimate terms with some scheik of the Red Sea peninsula, I would make application for the doctor's intercession with the scheik for enlightenment on the subject.—Yours, etc.

¹ There is not much in the observation that the word *Arnebeth*—(*mutatis mutandis*), being the same in the Syriac and Arabic, is simply copied from the Hebrew. For the same similarity holds in the case of other terms. For instance, and to go no farther than our texts in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, the word for a *camel* is (as a great authority notices) found in all the Phœnicio-Shemitic languages. And the reason is very evident. A complete intercommunity must have been established by such events as the passage in Genesis xxxvii. 25—28 denotes. Ishmaelites from Gilead "with their camels," bearing merchandise, were on their road to Egypt. The three countries of Syria, Canaan, and Arabia must have been common to those camel-owning "Midianites merchantmen."

In fact, the term immediately in question is of extremely wide acceptation. Substantially the same collection of letters has denoted the animal on the banks of the Nile and those of the Indus—by the side of the classic *Illyrius* and by the side of *Tiber*, equally classic—beside the *Ganges of the East* and the *Thames of the West*. In short, the Coptic and the Sanscrit, the Greek and the Latin, the old Hebrew and our own English, have all the same way of naming the *ship of the desert*.—W. H. G.

REMARKS ON PHIL. II. 6, 7.

"WHO, BEING IN THE FORM OF GOD, THOUGHT IT NOT ROBBERY,"
ETC. THE AUTHORIZED VERSION OF THE PASSAGE SUFFICIENTLY
ACCURATE FOR ALL GENERAL PURPOSES.

OF late years, the authorized version of the Scriptures has been very roughly handled by critics generally. Not only have those verbal changes been pointed out which are consequent upon the growth of our language during two centuries, but an entirely new signification has been given to several passages. Now, I am ready to admit that all human productions are faulty, more or less, and that our English Bible cannot reasonably be considered an exception to the rule. But I am of opinion that a member of the Church by which the publication of the book is sanctioned, may shew a decided inclination towards the defensive in all debates concerning its accuracy, without laying himself open to the charge of being disregarding of truth. And, therefore, I now take into consideration a passage from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (chap. ii. verses 6, 7), and endeavour to shew that the authorized version of it is sufficiently accurate for all general purposes, and, indeed, preferable to either that given by the editor of *The Quiver*, or that given by Dean Alford.

The following is an extract from an article entitled, "Stray Notes upon Curious Bible Words," to be found in *The Quiver* of October 28th, 1865. It chiefly concerns the word "robbery:"—

"Phil. ii. 6, 'Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation.' It is generally taken for granted that the word 'robbery' here means the same as 'theft,' and that the passage is a statement that our blessed Lord did not think he was committing a theft or robbery in making himself equal with God, inasmuch as he really was God. Now this meaning of 'robbery' makes the most complete nonsense of the verse. For observe, so far from the statement being that he made himself God, the apostle says that he 'made himself of no reputation,' or, as the Greek is, 'emptied himself.' The apostle is not in this passage seeking to prove Christ's Divinity. He is taking that for granted as a truth so clear and well known as not to need any proof and argument, it being admitted by all Christians. The apostle is enforcing humility, and adducing Jesus Christ as an example, and to declare that our Lord committed no theft or robbery in making himself equal to God the Father, would—though the statement of a great and

absolute truth—be no illustration whatever of our blessed Saviour's humility. But take 'robbery' to signify not 'theft,' but simply a 'seizing' or 'snatching at' anything, and how clear does the meaning and force of the passage come out, and how splendid is it as an instance of unparalleled humility.

" 'Let this mind be in you,' says the apostle, urging them to be humble minded, 'which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form (*i.e.*, being a portion of the Godhead) of God,' and therefore able to come down to earth with all the power and majesty of God to triumph over his enemies, and crush every one who opposed him. So far from this, 'he thought it not a *thing to be snatched at—a thing to be grasped*—that he should be equal with God (*i.e.*, while here in the flesh); but, on the contrary, he emptied himself,' he laid aside the power of his Godhead, and actually allowed feeble man to crucify him. If 'robbery' meant 'theft,' the proper antithesis would be thus: 'Who, being in the form of God, thought it no theft to be equal with God: but took with him, while sojourning here, all the attributes and powers of the Deity.' But that is not, could not be the proper reading; for the apostle is adducing our Lord's humility in laying aside his power and majesty as God, as an example to his followers to be humble minded. Although Dean Alford does not take this view which I have ventured to suggest as the correct one, but interprets the passage—'He deemed not his equality with God a matter for grasping,' yet he well and happily observes on this word 'robbery'—" 'One thing must also be remembered, that in the word the leading idea is not snatching *from another*, but snatching, grasping *for one's self*.' This remark bears well on my interpretation, and seems to me an exquisite incidental proof of our Lord's Divinity. 'He thought it not a thing to be snatched at to make himself equal with God.' The idea not being that he could so much snatch Divine power *from* another, seeing that he *was* as God himself the real possessor of it; but he would not take or snatch *to himself*, *i.e.*, to his humanity, the fulness of the outward manifestation of that power."

"Such I venture to adopt as the real sense of the word 'robbery' in this remarkable and most beautiful passage of Scripture."

The following are my reasons for differing from the editor of *The Quiver*, on the one hand, and from Dean Alford on the other, and for believing that the English version, in this passage,

* "Alford's Greek Testament. *In loco*."

† "I have endeavoured to word the above passage very carefully, for we have to bear in mind that when speaking of our blessed Saviour's 'emptying himself' of his Divine power and glory, the apostle does not mean that any of the attributes, or powers, or functions of God were really wanting in that Divine nature which dwelt in the man Christ Jesus, but merely that in his earthly career there was not the development of that Divine omnipotence in action. For example, when suffering death, our Lord laid aside his Divine power, otherwise men could not have slain the incarnate God. It was not, however, that he really gave up his power, but that he gave up the exercise of it—not that he *could not*, but simply that he *did not* utterly destroy his murderers."

expresses the meaning of the original with sufficient accuracy:—

The word translated “robbery,” *HARPAZMOS*, belongs to a class of words (derived from the passive perfect) each of which, as I shall endeavour to shew by examples, supposes the action, which in its meaning it includes, to have already taken place, and to be itself *PAST* at the time indicated by the verb of the sentence, though its immediate effect remains; and *that in which the continuance of this effect consists* it is, that is signified by such a word.

The words in this class will obviously vary in meaning according to the circumstances they are placed in, the same word signifying, at one time, a state or condition, at another, a thing or person; but the above explanation applies, I believe, to every case.

Thus, *DESMOS* is derived from *DEO*, I tie or bind. It refers to the past act of *tying* or *binding*, the effect of which is before us in the shape (for instance) of a bundle, or of a person bound; and it signifies the *bond* with which such person or bundle is secured. It is not literally “a thing *for binding*” (as Dean Alford seems to consider), but that with which a person or thing *is bound*. A chain or cord is not strictly *DESMOS*, unless actually applied as a bond, unless *tied*. A person is not secured by a chain lying beside him: it is fastened round him; and his bondage (or state of being bound), therefore, consists in, or is constituted by, *a fastened chain*. *DESMOS* is a *fastened chain*, cord, or string. In the same way, *THESMOS* (from *TITHEMI*, or obsolete *THEO*, I place, lay down, or establish), refers to the past act of *establishing* (a law), the effect of which remains in force; and it signifies that in which the continuance of such law consists, namely, *a statute*. It is not “matter *for establishing*” (Dean Alford), but it implies that something *has been and is established*.

In *HAGIASMOS* (from *HAGIAZO*, I sanctify), we have a good instance of what I alluded to above, a word bearing a double meaning. St. Peter (1 Ep. i. 2) tells us that the Church is “elect, in sanctification of the Spirit” (that is, *EN HAGIASMO*), unto “*obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*” (*RHANTISMOS*, implying a *sprinkled* condition). And St. Paul (Heb. x. 29) would have us understand, that those belonging to the Church *are sanctified with* (or *in*) *the blood*, but that it is possible for individuals to “tread under foot the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing.” These passages taken together shew us, 1st, that the *RHANTISMOS* and *HAGIASMOS* of every individual date

from the same moment of time, and 2nd, that the continuance of the state of sanctification consists in *obedience*, as well as in *being sprinkled with the blood of Christ*. And, as a consequence, we find, that whereas in 1 Cor. i. 30, our HAGIASMOS is said to be CHRIST, since it is by reason of him that we have been and continue sanctified; in 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, etc., the term is used in the sense of *obedience* (or *holiness*), which is a sign of the state of sanctification, being indeed that unto which we are sanctified or set apart.

It will be observed, that a word of this sort often signifies that which has been *acted upon for the purpose of acting*, the special act being indicated by the *root* of the word. Thus DESMOS signifies that which is *fastened for the purpose of binding*; THESMOS, that which is *enacted for the purpose of establishing*; HAGIASMOS, that which is *set apart for the purpose of sanctifying*. In most of these cases the double act takes place at once: the *fastening* the chain and *its binding* the prisoner; the *enacting* the statute, and *its establishing* the law. But in the case of HAGIASMOS, it would appear to be different (at least when the word is used in one of its significations). The oil which sanctified the persons and things anointed with it, and became their HAGIASMOS, was holy or sanctified before (*vide* Exod. xxx.). And so Christ, who becomes the HAGIASMOS of all who are sprinkled with his blood, says, in his prayer (John xvii.), "For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth." I mention this, because it seems to favour Dean Alford's translation of HARPAGMOS ("matter for grasping"), *matter for sanctifying* appearing to be the proper rendering of HAGIASMOS. But it is evident, that the instance in this respect is exceptional; for the very nature of the case implies the previous holiness of that which sanctifies. The touch of a thing unholy could never sanctify. But, in as far as the special act referred to by the word HAGIASMOS is concerned, the exceptional character of the case is more apparent than real. For the oil in being applied, the blood of Christ in being sprinkled, is set apart (or sanctified) to a particular purpose; and it is then only, I contend, that either can properly be called HAGIASMOS. But to proceed.

There are many cases in which it is almost impossible to distinguish that upon which a condition or state depends, from the condition itself; and in a case of this kind, the word may safely be translated by a term signifying that condition. Thus SPASMOS, or *spasm*, from SPASO, I draw, signifies that in which a drawn condition (of muscles) consists; but as this is not distinguishable from the drawn condition itself, the word will bear having that signification given it. Indeed, each of the words

instanced above might, under certain circumstances, be translated by a term signifying the state or condition produced: thus DESMOS, a *bound* condition; THESMOS, an *established* condition; HAGIASMOS, a *sanctified* condition. Again, in some cases, the states or conditions are of such short duration, that that in which their continuance consists cannot be distinguished from the actions which produced them; and in a case of this kind, the word may be translated by a term signifying such action; as for instance, MERUKISMOS (from MERUKIZO, I cause to revolve, I chew the cud), which may be translated, *chewing the cud*, or rumination.

The greater number of words ending in -mos, and belonging to this class, are derived from verbs in -zo (-ASMOS from -AZO, -ISMOS from -IZO, etc.). Now, a verb of this kind is in most cases to be traced to some simpler form, either another verb or a noun; and it generally implies, when derived from another verb, that the act signified by that verb is performed by aid of some instrument or medium; when derived from a noun, that that which is signified by the noun is either applied, or brought about. Thus SKEPAZO is from SKEPO (I cover or conceal), and signifies, I place a covering, *I cover with a cover*; KONDULIZO is from KONDULOS (the knuckle or fist), and signifies, I strike with the fist, that is, I *apply* the fist.

The words of this class (especially when derived from such verbs as those just mentioned), can safely be translated by a term signifying the action, even though it be past; as BAPTISMOS, the act of washing, or rather, a *washing*; SALPISMOS (from SALPIZO, I sound a trumpet—SALPIGX), the act of sounding a trumpet, or rather a *sounding of trumpets*; the actions and their immediate results being in these cases scarcely distinguishable. KONDULISMOS (from KONDULIZO) is another of this sort, signifying an application of the fist, or rather, a *blow*, the immediate result.

But when a double action is implied, as explained above, the word is sometimes applied to the medium—to that which is acted upon for the purpose of acting. For instance, SKEPASMOS (from SKEPAZO), is that which is *caused to cover*, namely, a *veil*; TRUPANISMOS is that which is *caused to bore* (from TRUPANIZO), viz., a *borer* or *gimlet* (or engraving instrument). And it is evident, that the immediate effects produced by the actions in these cases depend for their continuance upon these media, the immediate effect in any such case being *the action of the medium*. The action of the prime agent causes the instrument to act, and the action of the instrument causes the ulterior effect. Thus, the effect of causing a gimlet to bore is *boring*, the effect of boring is a *hole* (TRUPEMA, from the perfect passive of the

simpler form ΤΡΥΠΑΟ, I bore—as does a gimlet, not of ΤΡΥΠΑΝΙΖΟ, I bore—as does he who uses the gimlet). Remove the veil, and there is no longer any concealment; cease to move the gimlet, and there is no longer any boring. It must be understood, therefore, that strictly speaking a word like ΤΡΥΠΑΝΙΣΜΟΣ signifies an instrument in actual use, “one that has been caused to (bore) and is (bor)-ing.” I grant that it implies, that what is used *has been made* (or is suitable) *for the purpose* or action signified. But I am of opinion, that it is outraging the language to give this as the literal meaning of such a term; and that *it is only because the same instrument serves during several operations, that it is allowed to bear such a title, whether in actual use or not.*

Hence do I conclude, that a term of the class under consideration never signifies “a thing to be (act)-ed;” as, for instance, “a thing to be bored;” and that though it may sometimes be applied to “a thing for (act)-ing,” it is only by a philological license, and only in certain cases; that is, when the term is derived from a verb that is traceable to another verb of simpler form, and a double action is implied; and when, moreover, it signifies an instrument that lasts during several actions.

The question now arises, Is ΗΑΡΠΑΓΜΟΣ one of this kind, and may it therefore, by any allowable stretch of the laws of language, be translated, “*matter for grasping?*”

ΗΑΡΠΑΓΜΟΣ is derived from ΗΑΡΠΑΖΟ. Now, this is undoubtedly similar in appearance to the secondary verbs we have been speaking of. But in the Lexicon it is marked as *primitive*. Let us, then, examine the verb, Η-ΑΡ-ΠΑ-ΖΟ. Ζο is the sign of the verb, an intensified present, signifying, *I cause with energy*. Η represents the digamma, the second pronominal element, and signifies *propinquity*, or *near to here*. ΑΡ or ΡΑ signifies *motion* from one point to another; that is, in this case, from *near to here* to *here*, which latter is signified by ΡΑ, the first pronominal element. The root of the verb, then, signifies “motion from *near to here* to *here*,” and the whole word, “I energetically cause motion from *thee* to *me*,” hence, “I snatch at,” “I grasp,” “I seize violently.” Our English word “*rapacity*” contains the same elements with the exception of the remains of the digamma; and, therefore, would signify a more extensive “gathering to oneself.” Now, the Greek word, ΗΑΙΡΟ, contains the two first elements of ΗΑΡΠΑΖΟ; but it lacks that one which signifies that the motion is directed towards oneself. It therefore simply means, “I cause motion from the neighbourhood;” that is, “I carry,” “I take away.” ΗΑΡΠΑΖΟ is nearer to this verb, however, both in structure and in signification, than to any

other primitive in the language. But it is not formed from it (if at all) in the same manner as those secondary verbs are, from their simpler forms; and consequently it is not one of their class. Nor is there any need for supposing that a double action is implied, as in the case of *DEO* (I bind); for no instrument is needed either by God or man for *grasping*. We read of "binding *with chains*" (Mark v. 4); but though it is mentioned, that "the violent *take the kingdom of heaven by force*" (*HARPAZOUSIN*), no instrument or medium is mentioned (Matt. xi. 12).

I have already shewn that words like *HARPAGMOS* may always safely be translated by a word signifying the action which is implied,—“a binding,” “a washing,” etc. Their exact meaning in any given case is only to be arrived at by considering the context. What then, in the first place, is the *action* implied by *HARPAGMOS*? We have found that the verb from which it is derived signifies, “an energetic drawing to oneself of that which is near;” and we have, moreover, seen this verb used for the purpose of signifying the action of *violent persons*. We may, therefore, safely translate the word, “a grasping,” “a seizing violently,” “a pulling” (see Jude 23). That which persons seize violently, as a general rule, they have no just right to. And therefore, the word may be considered to mean, when not qualified, “usurpation,” or even “robbery.” Indeed, when we recollect that *s* and *h* equally represent the digamma, we cannot fail to notice the strong resemblance which *uS-uR-P* bears to *H-aR-Pa-zo*. So much for the action implied; but what is the exact meaning of the word in the passage before us?

Let us apply the rule which I gave at the beginning: we have found it answer hitherto. According to that rule, *HARPAGMOS* refers to an action that is itself *past* at the time indicated by the verb of the sentence, though its immediate effect remains; and *that in which the continuance of this effect consists* it is that is signified by the word. Very well, the past action is the *seizing*, and its immediate effect *the being in possession of that which one had not before*. This effect remains: in what does its continuance consist? Is it not in *the possession of that which has been seized*? And is not this *a state acquired by seizure*? Surely there is no difficulty so far. And we have but to examine the context to see that this is the exact meaning conveyed. For there we see that to *HARPAGMOS* is opposed to *EINAI ISA THEO*, which signifies a state or condition, namely, *the being as God* (being equivalent to a verbal noun-substantive). Now, no two nouns-substantive can be opposed to each other, and contrasted, as are these two, unless their ideas be similar in their subsistence, that is, unless both represent things or persons, or both,

states or conditions. The idea of a state or condition cannot be opposed to that of a thing or person, nor *vice versâ*, can the idea of a person or thing be opposed to that of a condition or state. Here, however, we have HARPAGMOS, a noun-substantive, opposed to that which is equivalent to a noun-substantive, TO EINAI ISA THEO. If one, then, signify a condition or state, so must the other. To EINAI ISA THEO does signify a state or condition, that of equality with God. Therefore, I am bold to assert, that HARPAGMOS signifies a state or condition also, namely, *that acquired by seizure*. And consequently, I translate the verse thus: "Who, being in the form of God, deemed not his possessing the attributes of Deity, a possession of that which had been seized." Or, "Who, being in the form of God, deemed not his being as God, a state acquired by seizure." Or, as it is in the English version, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."

If emphasis be placed, as in the original, upon HARPAGMON, "robbery," there need be no difficulty, I think, in discovering the proper antithesis between this verse and the next. It will be remembered that the Jews often accused Christ of robbery, for making himself equal with God (John v. 18; x. 33); and that when he was crucified, those passing by reviled him, saying, "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross" (Matt. xxvii. 40). Now his tamely yielding to his murderers might appear to have been an admission that his equality with God was a false boast. But it was not so. He did not surrender because he thought that he had no proper title to equality with God; but because, for our sakes, he had chosen to empty himself, taking upon him the form of a servant,—because, being found in fashion as a man, he had humbled himself, and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. And the Apostle would have us be like-minded. He would have us be humble, not only when we have no right to more respect than that which is shewn us, nor only when we cannot help ourselves: he would have us be humble, when we are slighted and reviled, though we have it in our power to assert our own proper dignity. Nay, he would have us be humble even at the risk, if need be, of making others conclude us guilty of having previously assumed a dignity far above that which belonged to us.

He who is quite sure that the dignity he possesses is properly his own, does not fear, when the occasion demands, to lay it aside. That this idea was held as the key to the text, by the early Church, may be inferred from a homily of Chrysostom's on this very passage: "Whatever one has seized, and taken beyond what is proper, *that* he dares not lay aside, but always

holds it fast, fearing lest he should ruin himself, lest he should fall; but he who has a natural dignity, fears not even to descend from that dignity, knowing that nothing such will follow.”*

Such are my reasons for adhering to the translation of the passage adopted in the English version; such are the arguments I would produce in favour of it.

D. B.

* The foregoing interpretation of the text is also strongly supported by a corresponding passage in St. John's gospel:—"Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God; he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself" (chap. xiii. 3, 4, etc.). For here we are plainly told that it was because our Lord had no doubt respecting his natural dignity, that he humbled himself, and "took upon him the form of a servant," without reluctance.

True dignity is not incompatible with the consciousness thereof; for we cannot exercise humility after the example of Christ, without being conscious that we are laying aside that which is properly our own. But it is opposed to every species of ostentation. For ostentation (including *haughtiness* as well as *display*) is nothing more nor less than the expression of an anxiety respecting the preservation of a dignity, in the possession of which a man does not feel himself to be firmly settled. It is this idea that explains our Lord's words in Matt. xxiii. 11, 12: "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant," that is, by voluntarily becoming your servant, he shall prove his greatness. "Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased;" in other words, he shall find his proper level, which the very fact of his exalting himself proves to be low and mean. "And he that shall humble himself shall be exalted," his proper dignity shall be made manifest; for it is only he who is supported by the consciousness of possessing a true dignity, that will voluntarily appear in a position below that which he thinks the world considers his station in life, or be engaged in an occupation, even for the benefit of others, that is by his compeers deemed mean and despicable.

Society of Antiquaries.—Feb. 15.—Earl Stanhope, President, in the chair. Mr. Lewin read a paper "On the Site of the Holy Sepulchre." The site he advocates is the traditional one; and he disposes of the difficulty of its being within the city, by endeavouring to shew that the second wall took a sudden turn eastward very near the point where the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre stands. His views are briefly these: 1. The first, or most ancient wall of Jerusalem, encompassed the City of Jebus, or Zion; and the Castle of David occupied the site on which the citadel of Herod's Palace was afterwards built. 2. The second wall, built by David and Solomon, was enlarged by the addition of a small piece by Hezekiah, and it is this enlargement which produces the irregularity of outline that enables us to place the Church of the Holy Sepulchre outside the wall, instead of within it. 3. The third wall was built by Agrippa, and not till ten years after the crucifixion. Between the second and third walls were several tombs—two now known as those of Joseph and Nicodemus, and the monument of the High Priest John, mentioned in Josephus. It is not unreasonable, therefore, that our Lord should have been interred there.—Mr. Fergusson was present, and said that he still adhered to the theory put forward by himself, that the Mosque of Omar was erected in the time of Constantine, and covered the real site of the Holy Sepulchre.—Mr. Hepworth Dixon remarked that the question was one which must be left to the decision of the spade, and referred to the labours of the Palestine Exploration Committee as likely to set it at rest.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[We wish our readers to understand that we cannot be held responsible for the opinions of our contributors and correspondents. The utmost we can do is to keep a careful eye upon the literary character of their communications, and to see that they do not transcend the limits of fair criticism and lawful inquiry.]

ON THE AHASUERUS AND ARTAXERXES OF
EZRA IV. 6, 7.

I. *IT has been commonly supposed that by Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes in Ezra iv. 6, 7, are meant Cambyses and Smerdis the Magian. Hence no little difficulty.* This has arisen, I think, from inattention to Hebrew idiom and style, though the mistake is very natural, and the ordinary view at first sight appears to be the true one.

A few remarks are necessary by way of introduction. The order of narration in the Hebrew books is very frequently not the order of events. The subject-matter, not the chronology, determines the order of narration. The purpose of this is to keep different subjects distinct, and it is a plan followed by several lucid historians, specially by Gibbon. Thus Gen. ii. does not follow Gen. i. chronologically, though it does in the order of the narrative. The events related in Gen. xxxix., etc., do not follow after the whole of those related in Gen. xxxviii.; this last chapter has a distinct subject, viz., the account of Joseph, etc. Some parts only of the two narratives are contemporaneous. The history of Judah's marriage and family, once begun, is carried through, and so done with. Thus again Deut. x. 8 does not follow chronologically verses 6, 7 of the same chapter, but is resumptive; compare verses 1, 8. Indeed it is an old remark of the rabbis that chronological order is not observed in the Pentateuch.

Ezra, in the case above-mentioned, offers, I believe, another example. Our division into chapters and verses has in some degree helped the prevailing error, not to say that the divisions in the Hebrew Bible have done the same thing, they also being without any true authority.

Having begun with the decree of Cyrus, chap. i., for the building of the temple, and brought the narrative down to the laying of its foundation amidst shouts of joy from the people, chap. i.—iii., Ezra goes on to describe in chap. iv. the opposition raised to the work at that period; and, once on this topic, he is led to complete the subject of the opposition which the Jews met with generally from the people of the land and the provincial governors in different reigns up to his own time, viz., in those of Cyrus, iv. 1—5; Ahasuerus or Xerxes, iv. 6; and Artaxerxes, iv. 7—24. It is here, viz., iv. 24, that our division into chapters and verses misleads, as also our translation.

The narrative goes on, in the Authorized Version, thus, iv. 24^b; "So it ceased unto the second year of the reign of Darius, king of Persia. *Then* the prophets Haggai," etc. Here *so* and *then* are in the original ו and ו; just as *now when* and *then*, iv. 1, 2; Gen. xlii. 1; Exod. ii. 15, are also ו and ו; and just as for *and when* without *then* we have also ו and ו, iii. 1; iii. 10; Gen. xvii. 1; xxv. 24; xxx. 1; xlix. 33; l. 4, 11, 15; Exod. ii. 6, 13, 18; and as *but when*, first without *then*, and afterwards with it, are equally faithful renderings in Neh. ii. 19, 20, of the same idiomatic use of the conjunction ו. A great number of similar passages might be added, as any one at all acquainted with Hebrew knows. If then we only translate iv. 24^b and v. 1 as iv. 1, 2, are translated, we shall see how the narrative is here resumed from iv. 5, and how the subject is now a different one.

After a narrative of all the obstacles which the Jews met with in rebuilding their temple down to the writer's own time, another now begins which relates the resumption of the work; and this also is brought down not only to the dedication in the sixth year of Darius, vi. 15, at which period the temple was in one sense finished, but to what was afterwards done for its thorough completion, and "to beautify it," vii. 1, 27, *in the reign of Artaxerxes and the writer's own day.*^a "Now when it was being stopped^b [or, when it was at a stop] during^c the second year of the reign of Darius, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah prophesied, etc. Then [*i. e.*, at the same time, or, immediately, ~~etc.~~] Zerubbabel," etc. The second year of Darius was the turning-point in the work, and that from which the completion issued, so much so that the dedication took place only four years afterwards, and therefore it is no wonder that Ezra thus specially noted it.

The above view is confirmed by several particulars.

^a Although Ezra seems to say in our Authorized Version, vi. 15, that the house "*was finished*" in the sixth year of Darius," yet in almost the same sentence we find it added, that "*it was finished*" by the commandment of Cyrus and Darius and Artaxerxes, vi. 14. The fact is that there are two different verbs for this in the original. In ver. 15, we have a conjugation of מָצַא, and the meaning strictly is "to make to come forth," from which it has acquired that of "to bring to an end." In ver. 14 we have one of מָלַא from מָלֵא, "*the whole*," and the meaning is "to make complete." The latter of these verbs, or that used for the period including the reign of Artaxerxes, has clearly the stronger sense of the two, since the building of a temple or church may be brought to an end for a time, and so far as to enable it to be dedicated and used for Divine worship, though it may be far from being completed, and may afterwards receive much addition or embellishment.

^b The Chaldee has here, chap. iv. 24, as is very common, the participle with the auxiliary verb.

^c מְ. Though the most common sense of this word is "*until*," the first in Gesen., and according to him the primary one, is "*during*." The limit of time itself, not the interval up to the limit, is signified in 1 Sam. i. 22. Even when it means "*until*," it includes the limit; see Dan. vi. 7; Hos. x. 12. Observe also its use in Ezra vi. 18, Authorized Version, "*on the third day of the month Adar.*"

(1.) Ezra anticipates the reign of Artaxerxes much in the same manner, though more briefly, vi. 14.

(2.) He had already brought the subject of the opposition down to the reign of Darius, iv. 5, before mentioning Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes. Why should he have done this, if by Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes he meant Cambyzes and Smerdis the Magian, *who reigned before Darius?*

(3.) In the letter written against the Jews to Artaxerxes it is the building of the *city*, not the building of the temple, which is insisted on. This may, indeed, have been a stroke of policy on the part of the adversaries, and, no doubt, was so in part, for there is certainly exaggeration in their charge; they even say that the Jews had *completed*^d the walls, and *knit the foundations together*; nevertheless the assertion is so prominent and positive, that had there been no ground for it whatever it might have been turned against them.

(4.) Daniel adopts the same method of order by subject-matter, in lieu of order by time, in his visions. Thus he brings the vision of the image down to the kingdom of Christ, and then returns to the First Empire, and goes over the same ground under a different aspect, till he brings the view of the four empires, as *persecuting* powers, down to the same point as in the image. He uses a similar method in the visions of the ram and the he-goat, and also in the final vision concerning the fortunes of the Jewish people.

(5.) In the Book of Revelation we find exactly the same plan pursued over and over again, and this sometimes without any clear indications that the subject is carried back to some antecedent point of time, such as we have in Daniel.

Thus it appears that by Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes Ezra may well have meant Xerxes and Artaxerxes Longimanus, not Cambyzes and Smerdis the Magian: and there is nothing to surprise us in the fact, that renewed opposition to the Jews and their work of restoration generally was attempted even in the early part of the reign of Artaxerxes, though the mind of that king was in time favourably impressed towards them. In fact, it is just what might be expected at the beginning of a new reign: comp. Acts xxiv. 27; xxv. 2. We know, also, from the Book of Nehemiah, that the opposition did not cease even after Artaxerxes' decrees.

II. *The testimony of Josephus, who distinctly attributes to Cambyzes (Antiq., xi., 2) the decree recorded in the fourth chapter of Ezra, will naturally appear, at first sight, a serious objection to the view taken above; but, on close examination, it will be found that his authority in this case, and generally as regards times long antecedent to his own, is of very little value.*

(1.) His works, as we know, date only from the latter half of the

^d 573, Authorized Version, "set up," which is not the meaning. The margin accordingly gives "finished."

first-century of the Christian era. The Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, on the contrary, had been in existence several centuries before him, had been translated by the LXX., and were counted among the Sacred Books of the Jews. The two former of them, at least, profess to have been written, and all bear evidence of having been written, contemporaneously, or nearly so, with a great part of the events which they narrate.

(2.) Josephus distinctly states that he drew the materials for his *Antiquities* from the Sacred Books of his nation, of which, as has been said, those of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther formed a part. Preface to *Antiq.*, ii., 1^a: "The present work will contain all our antiquities and the constitution of our government, as interpreted out of the Hebrew Scriptures." Ibid: "*As I proceed I shall accurately describe what is contained in our records, in the order of time that belongs to them; for I have already promised to do so throughout this undertaking, and this without adding anything to what is therein contained, or taking away anything from them.*" *Antiq.*, iii., v. 2: "I am under necessity of relating this history" [the transactions at Sinai] "as I find it in the Sacred Books;" x. 10: [speaking of the times of Daniel], "Let no one blame me for writing down everything of this nature, as I find it in our ancient books; for, as to that matter, I have plainly assured those that think me defective in any such point, or complain of this history, that I intended to do no more than translate the Hebrew books into the Greek language, and promised to explain those facts, without adding anything to them of my own, or taking anything away from them."

(8.) Notwithstanding this Josephus has added to and taken from what the Jewish Scriptures say, in instances too numerous to relate fully. A few examples will suffice to shew this. Again and again he concocts long speeches, and puts them into the mouth, *ex. gr.*, of God, of Noah, of Abraham, of Jacob, of Moses, etc. Such a practice was indeed common to historians at that time; but the professions of Josephus, and the subjects he had to deal with, should have prevented him from adopting it. He says that before the Fall, "all living creatures had one language;" that after it the serpent was deprived both of speech and feet (i. 1, 4); that Abraham's reason for going down into Egypt was not merely the famine, but that he wished to "become an auditor of the Egyptian priests, and to know what they said concerning the gods, designing either to follow them, if they had better notions than he, or to convert them into a better way, if his own notions proved the truest" (i. 8, 1); that when there "he taught the Egyptians arithmetic and astronomy" (i. 8, 2); that when to deliver Lot, he followed and fell on the Assyrians, some of them were drunk (i. 10, 1); that Jacob was drunk when Leah was imposed on him (i. 19, 7). The birth of Jacob and Esau is made to happen after the death of Abraham (i. 18, 1). He has many stories about Moses, evidently without any historical authority, and mere

* Whiston's translation is used in all the ensuing extracts.

fables, *e. g.*, that an Egyptian scribe foretold to the king that a child would be born about the time that Moses was, who would bring Egypt low, raise Israel, excel all men in virtue, etc. (i. 9, 2); that God gave Moses, when he was but three years old, such tallness as was wonderful (i. 9, 6); that when still a child he threw the king of Egypt's crown down, and trod upon it (i. 9, 7). Then we have a war with the Ethiopians, and Moses as commander-in-chief of the Egyptian forces; the envy of the king at his military success, and this assigned as the cause of his flight from Egypt (i. 10, 11). Pharaoh's permission for the *men* to depart is made to happen after the plague of lice, instead of after that of the locusts (ii. 14, 3). When the waters were healed at Marah it was, Josephus says, through Moses commanding the strong men in the army to draw out the greater part of the water, "So they laboured at it till the water was so agitated and purged as to be fit to drink" (iii. 1, 2). We have a strange account of the descent of the manna, and of its sticking to Moses's hands (iii. 1, 6). Our historian tells us that the mountain of Sinai "cannot be looked at without pain to the eyes" (iii. 5, 1); that Moses left it to God to be present at his sacrifices when He pleased, and when He pleased to be absent (iii. 8, 6); that the oracle of the Urim and Thummim left off shining 200 years before he, Josephus, wrote, in plain contradiction to the Scriptures (iii. 8, 9). He interprets the passage (Ex. xxii. 28) about not speaking evil of the judges, there called gods, thus, "Let no one blaspheme those gods which other cities call such" (iv. 8, 10); says that Moses told the people that an aristocracy is the best form of government (iii. 8, 17); that Moses did not die, "that he wrote so in the Holy Books, lest the people should venture to say that because of his extraordinary virtue he went to God" (iv. 8, 48). These are but a few specimens, but quite enough.

(4.) *Josephus not only makes unauthorized additions, but he suppresses, e. g.*, he says nothing of Moses killing the Egyptian, ii. 2; nor a word about the golden calf, the sin of Aaron, and the breaking of the first tables, iii. 5.

(5.) Thus *Josephus is not an accurate or trustworthy historian, when relating times much anterior to his own.* He had evidently no critical knowledge. He had no access to the Persian archives,* nor was he a man of close and painstaking research. He is rhetorical and artificial; and his writings afford a striking contrast to the sim-

* As to what he says, *Antiq.*, xiv., 10, 1, it appears from the passage itself to refer to public decrees, and it will be seen, I think, by what will presently be clearly shewn of the sources from which Josephus drew, that he had no more in view in speaking thus of the Persians, than what is recorded in the Scriptures and the Book of Esdras. Here however is the passage: "Many will not believe what hath been written about us by the Persians and Macedonians, because those writings are not everywhere to be met with, nor do lie in public places, but among us ourselves, and certain other barbarous nations, while there is no contradiction to be made against the decrees of the Romans, for they are laid up in the public places of the cities, and are extant still in the capital, and engraven upon pillars of brass." He then proceeds to give several decrees of the Roman senate, Julius Cæsar, etc., which had reference to the Jews.

plicity, brevity, and circumstantiality of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

(6.) *Joseph chiefly made use of the LXX. translation and the Apocryphal Books, not of the Hebrew original.* Though he no doubt knew the latter, and in some few instances follows it rather than the LXX., and in some differs from both, yet it can be clearly shewn that in general he drew from the Greek translation and the Apocryphal Books. This will be made plain by the following examples:—

(i.) He adds 100 years to the ages of Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahaleel, Enoch, at the birth of their elder sons, as the LXX. does; though in the case of Methuselah and Lamech, where the difference is less, he follows the Hebrew.

(ii.) He makes the flood begin on the 27th day of the second month, as the LXX., not on the 17th, as the Hebrew. [/] Gen. vii. 2.

(iii.) No one can read the account in Josephus of the letter said by him to have been written by Cambyses, xi., 2, 1, and not see (1st) that it was taken by him from the Apocryphal Third Book of Esdras, [/] not from the Hebrew of Ezra iv.; and (2nd) that this latter was the original of both; although Josephus attributes the letter to Cambyses, while the Book of Esdras attributes it to Artaxerxes.

(iv.) This is followed both in Josephus, xi. 3, and in the Third Book of Esdras, by the account of Zerubbabel being superior to the rest in the solution of the questions proposed by Darius, of which there is nothing in Ezra and the Hebrew.

(v.) He makes the temple to be finished on the 23rd day of the month Adar, not on the 3rd, as the Hebrew of Ezra and even the LXX. In this again he follows the Third Book of Esdras.

(vi.) But in Ezra iii. we have a very curious example, and one closely connected with our present subject, and the authority of Josephus in respect to it.

It may be well to give the account in full from Josephus, and from our Authorized Version:—

Antiq., xi., 4, 2: "In the second year of their coming to Jerusalem, as the Jews were there in the second month, the building of the temple went on apace (*συνείχετο*, 'was set to at'); and when they had laid its foundations on the first day of the second of that second year, they set *προσθησάμενοι*, as overseers of the work, such Levites as were full twenty years old; and Jeshua and his sons and brethren, and Cadmiel the brother of Judas, the son of Aminadab, with his sons; and the temple, by the great diligence of those that had the care of it, was finished, *ἔλαβε τέλος*, sooner than any one would have expected. And when the temple was finished, *ἀπαρτισθέντος*, the priests, adorned with their accustomed garments, stood *ἀναστάντες*, with their trumpets, while the Levites stood and sung hymns to

[/] He adopts the foolish story of the angel's union with women; and here, while some copies of the LXX. have the "sons of God," others have "the angels," which reading Grabe considers the more probable of the two.

^{*} So called in the sixth Article of the Church of England, otherwise Esdras α'.

God, according as David first of all appointed them to bless God. Now the priests and Levites, and the elder part of the families, recollecting with themselves how much greater and more sumptuous the old temple had been, seeing that now made, how much inferior it was, on account of their poverty, to that which had been built of old, considered with themselves how much their happy state was sunk below what it had been of old, as well as their temple. Hereupon, they were disconsolate and not able to contain their grief, and proceeded so far as to lament and shed tears on these accounts; but the people in general were contented with their present conditions, and because they were allowed to build them a temple, they desired no more, and neither regarded, nor remembered, nor indeed at all tormented themselves with the comparison of that and the former temple, as if this were below their expectations; but the wailing of the old men and of the priests, on account of the deficiency of this temple, in their opinion, if compared with that which had been demolished, overcame the sounds of the trumpets and the rejoicing of the people."

There can be no doubt that Josephus meant this of the same transactions as those related in Ezra iii. 8—13: "Now in the second year of their coming unto the house of God at Jerusalem, in the second month, began Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, and Jeshua, the son of Jozadak, and the remnant of their brethren, the priests and the Levites, and all they that were come out of the captivity unto Jerusalem; and appointed the Levites, from twenty years old and upward, to set forward the work of the house of the LORD. Then stood Jeshua with his sons and his brethren, Kadmiel and his sons, the sons of Judah, together, to set forward the workmen in the house of God; the sons of Henadad with their sons and their brethren the Levites. And when the builders laid the foundation of the temple of the LORD, they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with cymbals, to praise the LORD, after the ordinance of David, king of Israel. And they sang together by course in praising and giving thanks unto the LORD; because *he is* good, for His mercy *endureth* for ever toward Israel. And all the people shouted with a great shout, when they praised the LORD, because the foundation of the house of the LORD was laid. But many of the priests and Levites, and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice; and many shouted aloud for joy: so that the people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people; for the people shouted with a loud shout, and the noise was heard afar off." But Josephus took his account from the LXX. version of Ezra, and from the Apocryphal Third Book of Esdras, not from the Hebrew.

(a) This appears first in a trivial matter and an incidental way from his having followed their translation in ver. 10. He does not indeed copy their bald expressions, but relates the events in more elegant and rhetorical language. Nevertheless he copies their

mistake. In ver. 8 the LXX. have rightly rendered the Hebrew קָמָּוּ (hiphil of קָם), "they *set* the Levites," $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \Lambda\epsilon\upsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$, where the verb is in the first aorist, and transitive. But in ver. 10 they have translated the same Hebrew verb, in the same conjugation, "the priests stood," $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \omicron\iota\ \iota\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, where the verb is in the second aorist, and intransitive, and this is followed in the Third Book of Esdras. It should be, "they *set* the priests," as in our Authorized Version. Josephus has copied the mistake, though slightly varying the word $\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. This indeed is a trifle. (b) But this is not all. There is an expression in the Hebrew of ver. 10, which might be thought at first sight ambiguous, but which is far from being so in reality. A little common sense, not to say a knowledge of the Hebrew idiom, soon clears away the ambiguity. The LXX., by inserting the word $\kappa\alpha\iota$, "and," have got rid of the ambiguity indeed, but in a wrong sense; and this, I cannot but think, helped to mislead Josephus, and to make him finish the building of the temple at this time, and throw these transactions, which were clearly, according to Ezra, in the reign of Cyrus, and had reference only to the laying of the foundations, into that of Darius, in which latter, as is well known, the temple was built. I have said *helped*, for the same confusion is found in the Third Book of Esdras, which Josephus undoubtedly used, as has been shewn.

In verses 11, 12, we have in the Authorized Version, "And all the people shouted with a great shout, when they praised the LORD, because the foundation of the house of the LORD was laid. But many of the priests and Levites, and chief of the fathers, [who were] ancient men, *that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes*, wept with a loud voice, and many shouted aloud for joy." The Hebrew of the words in italics is:— $\text{וְהַיְּהוֹדִיעַ\ וְהַיְּהוֹדִיעַ\ וְהַיְּהוֹדִיעַ\ וְהַיְּהוֹדִיעַ\ וְהַיְּהוֹדִיעַ}$, literally, "who had seen the first house when it was being founded this house before their eyes." In the infinitive, with the suffix pronoun וְהַיְּהוֹדִיעַ , "when it was being founded," the pronoun "it" seems at first sight to refer to the nearest antecedent, "*the first house*," but common sense tells us that it cannot do so, for none of those who were present when the second temple was being founded in the reign of Cyrus could have been living when the first was being founded in the reign of Solomon. The pronoun refers to the somewhat more remote antecedent occurring at the end of the eleventh verse, "*the house of the LORD*," i. e., the second house,—to that in fact which forms the main subject of the whole narrative. Numerous examples might be adduced of the similar reference of a pronoun, not to the ultimate antecedent, but to the penultimate, especially when that contains the principal subject of the narrative.^a

But not only so; a delicacy of Hebrew idiom decides the matter in the same sense. The pronoun וְהַיְּהוֹדִיעַ is not unfrequently emphatic, as

^a See several examples in Elliott's *Hor. Apoc.*, vol. ii., p. 484, fifth edition, under the passage, Rev. xi. 13.

Gesenius has remarked; he might have said emphatic and *explicative*. Thus Psalm civ. 25, "O LORD, how manifold are thy works. In wisdom hast thou made them all. This great sea, for instance, גָּדוֹל וְרָחֹב , (so) great and wide, wherein," etc. Psalm lxxviii. 8, "The earth shook, the heavens also dropped, at the presence of God, even Sinai, וְעַל הַר [literally, *this* Sinai], at the presence of God, the God of Israel." Compare Judges v. 5. There is no doubt, therefore, that our Authorized Version has given the right sense, viz., "many of those who were old men, who had seen the first house, when this house was being founded before their eyes, wept," etc. Several of them were probably very old. It was upwards of a half century since their temple had been burnt, their city destroyed, and they themselves had been in captivity. Their tears were not improbably tears of joy at the fulfilment of their long-cherished wishes and prayers, and at the marvellous fulfilment of the word of God by the prophet Isaiah (xliv. 28—xlv. 6), "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundations shall be laid." It will be observed that nothing is really said in the Hebrew text of Ezra about any comparison between the first and second temples, nor of the inferiority of the latter. This supposition has, not improbably, arisen from an erroneous view of the whole matter; for the second temple was not then built, but its first foundations only were being laid.

The LXX., by the insertion of *καὶ*, "and," have quite altered the complexion of the passage, and their *αὐτοῦ*, "of it," can refer to nothing but the first temple. Josephus was probably misled by using their version in this case, and the Apocryphal Third Book of Esdras; and thus he represents the building as finished at this time, though afterwards he goes on to describe its being built at a subsequent period, xi. 4, 7. To do this he has been obliged to throw the transactions related in Ezra iii., which really took place in the reign of Cyrus, into that of Darius, and has thus made a surprising confusion, such, indeed, as exists in the Third Book of Esdras.⁴

But here is the LXX. translation of Ezra. *Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐσήμεινε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ αἰνεῖν τῷ Κυρίῳ ἐπὶ τῇ θεμελιώσει τοῦ οἴκου Κυρίου· καὶ πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν Λευϊτῶν καὶ ἄρχοντας τῶν πατριῶν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ εἶδον τὸν οἶκον τὸν πρῶτον ἐν θεμελιώσει αὐτοῦ, ΚΑΙ τοῦτον τὸν οἶκον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκλαιον, κ.τ.λ.*

If any doubt could yet remain as to whether Josephus meant to speak of the same events as those narrated in Ezra iii., we have only to compare the account of what precedes and follows in his narrative and in Ezra: *e.g.*, 1st. What precedes, viz., the building of the altar,

⁴ And yet in his work against Apion he writes thus: "These accounts agree with the true histories in our books; for in them it is written that Nebuchadnezzar, in the eighteenth year of his reign, laid our temple desolate, and so it lay in that state of obscurity for fifty years; but that in the second year of the reign of Cyrus its foundations were laid, and it was finished again in the second year of Darius."

iii. 2; the feast of tabernacles, iii. 4; the oblations, etc., iii. 4—6; the money paid for cedars from Lebanon, etc., iii. 7. 2nd. What follows, viz., the enemies of the Jews wanting to come and build with them, etc. All this is the same, and in the same order, in the Scriptures and in Josephus; only he makes it take place under Darius, whereas the Scriptures distinctly place it in the reign of Cyrus. Josephus accordingly leaps from Ezra iv. 1 to Ezra v., and the letter of the provincial governors to Darius, the carrying on of the building in the meanwhile under Haggai and Zechariah, Darius's favourable answer, and the governors' forwarding the work (though he had before said that the building was finished), and "so the structure of the temple was with great diligence brought to a conclusion by the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, and by the injunctions of Cyrus and Darius," xi. 4, 7. He continues thus: "Now the temple was built in "seven years, and in the ninth year of the reign of Darius, on the 23rd day of the twelfth month, which is by us called Adar," etc. This account is manifestly from Ezra vi. 15, originally, though, as has been said, both the Hebrew and the LXX. here have the 3rd day of the month Adar, but the Book of Esdras the 23rd, and our present copies of the LXX. the *sixth* year of Darius, as the Hebrew, the LXX., and Esdras, not the *ninth*. The mistake of the *ninth* for the *sixth* is not difficult, perhaps, to account for by error of transcription in *Greek*, though *not in Hebrew*, since ΕΚΤΟΝ and ΕΝΑΤΟΝ differ very slightly, whereas in Hebrew such a mistake could not easily arise from a clerical error of יבן for יח. Josephus's copy may have contained ΕΝΑΤΟΝ, and to suppose that the temple was *seven* years in building was not an unnatural fancy for a Jew.

(7.) Thus we have seen not only that Josephus chiefly drew from the LXX., and the Apocryphal Third Book of Esdras, but how this led him into error. *We shall not have cause to wonder, therefore, at the confusion in his report, at second hand, of what is related in the Scriptures, as having occurred during the reigns of the Persian kings.*

The narrative of events which occurred to the Jews under these kings is found in the following sequence in the Hebrew, and in the LXX. respectively.

In the order in which the several books of the Scriptures stand in the Hebrew, Esther, it is true, precedes Ezra and Nehemiah; but the LXX. make the king who reigned in the days of Esther to be Artaxerxes. In this Josephus follows them, and he distinctly makes this king the successor of Xerxes, and therefore understand him to be the Artaxerxes of history, called Longimanus. xi. 6, 1., "After the death of Xerxes, the kingdom came to be transferred to his son Cyrus, whom the Greeks call Artaxerxes. When this man had obtained the government over the Persians, the whole nation of the Jews, with their wives and children, were in danger of perishing." He thus relates the history of Esther. We may, therefore, place the *Ἀρταξερξης* of the LXX. at the end of the list, thus:—

| | HEB. | A.V. | LXX. |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------|------------|
| Ezra i. 1. | צִיִּיב | Cyrus | Κυρος. |
| — iv. 6. | אֲחַשְׁוֵרֶשׁ | Ahasuerus | Ἀσσυνηρος. |
| — iv. 7. | אַרְטַחְשַׁתְרֵשׁ | Artaxerxes | Ἀρθασασθα. |
| — iv. 24. | דָּרִיּוֹס | Darius | Δαριεος. |
| — vii. i. Neh. ii. 1. } | אַרְטַחְשַׁתְרֵשׁ | Artaxerxes | Ἀρθασασθα. |
| Esther i. 1. | אֲחַשְׁוֵרֶשׁ | Ahasuerus | Ἀραξερξης. |

Let the reader keep his eye on the column of the LXX., as above. Here Cyrus, Darius, Artaxerxes stand in their true relative places as regards each other. Between Darius and Artaxerxes we find *Ἀρθασασθα*, a different name from *Ἀραξερξης*. But between Darius and Artaxerxes lived and reigned, as is well known, Xerxes. Therefore it was, not improbably, concluded hastily that the *Ἀρθασασθα* of Ezra and Nehemiah, according to the LXX., must be Xerxes, and so Josephus makes him, and speaks of the twenty-fifth, and even of the twenty-eighth year of his reign, though according to all other history, the reign of Xerxes did not exceed twenty years.

Again, between Cyrus and Darius we find firstly, *Ἀσσυνηρος*; and secondly, *Ἀρθασασθα*. This was no doubt a difficulty then, as it has been to the moderns. But between Cyrus and Darius there reigned only Cambyases, and for a brief period the Magian usurper Smerdis, who needed not, it was probably supposed, to be much accounted of. Cambyases occupies the chief place during this interval in history, and in the LXX. of Ezra, *Ἀρθασασθα*; and so Josephus attributes what is there said of the latter to Cambyases; or what is yet more probable, he followed, as we have seen that he so often did, the Apocryphal Book of Esdras, which speaks but of one king who offered interruption during the interval, and issued the decree. The Book of Esdras calls this king, it is true, Artaxerxes, but the LXX. of Ezra had called him Arthasastha, and so it was concluded that he could be none other than Cambyases, whereas the moderns, on the contrary, here make *Ἀσσυνηρος*, to whom the decree is not attributed, Cambyases, and *Ἀρθασασθα*, to whom it is attributed, Smerdis.

It is now universally allowed, I believe, that the *אֲחַשְׁוֵרֶשׁ*, Ahasuerus of Esther, called by the LXX., as we have seen, Artaxerxes, was Xerxes.

There are other curious little internal evidences of the inaccuracy

of Josephus in his account of the laying of the foundations of the temple which betray the rhetorician and the copyist, but which it would not be worth while to point out, except as a foil to the simple truthfulness of the original Hebrew record. xi. 4, 3, "But when the *Samaritans*, who were still enemies to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, *heard the sound of the trumpets*, they came running together, and desired to know what was the occasion of this tumult; and when they perceived that it was from the Jews who had been carried captive to Babylon, and were rebuilding the temple, they came to Zerubbabel and to Jeshua, and to the heads of families, and desired that they would give them leave to build the temple with them, etc., for they said, We worship their God, etc., and this ever since Shalmanezzer, the king of Assyria, transplanted us out of Cuthan and Media to this place." Where were these Samaritans living? Not in Samaria, for they could not have heard the sound of the trumpets there. It must of course, according to this narrative, have been in Jerusalem, or its immediate neighbourhood. But if so, they could not but have known of the preparations which had been for some time making for the laying of the foundation, and could not well have been ignorant of the ceremony which was going on. The fact is, that Josephus here again followed the Third Book of Esdras, and in both the simplicity of truth which characterizes the original narrative, and which may be seen faithfully transferred to our Authorized Version, is here entirely lost. See Ezra iv. 1, 2, and comp. Neh. iv. 1, 2. Josephus, again, is so taken up with the comparison of the two temples, and the supposed inferiority of the second at a time when it was not yet built, that in a passage immediately preceding the last extract, he gives a rhetorical colouring to the facts which the original does not warrant, and of which there is no trace even in the LXX. He tells us that "the wailing of the old men and of the priests on account of the deficiency of this temple in their opinion, if compared with that which had been demolished, *overcame the sound of the trumpets* and the rejoicing of the people." The original merely says that "the people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping." Here again Josephus has blindly and exactly followed the apocryphal record of Esdras.

III. *In conclusion, it will be seen, in the view here maintained, that the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther in the Hebrew are consistent in the use of names for the Persian kings; that who always means Cyrus, ~~who~~ Darius, ~~who~~ [Authorized Version, Ahasuerus] Xerxes, and ~~who~~ Artaxerxes, the Artaxerxes Longimanus of history. Although the same name may have been borne by more than one king in Persia, as in other countries, yet there, as elsewhere, there was usually some way of distinguishing them. And, certainly, it is not likely that ~~who~~ should be the name both of*

¹ A Median Ahasuerus is mentioned in Dan. ix. 1, the father of Darius the Mede, and supposed to be Cyaxares.

Cambyzes and Xerxes, and ~~perhaps~~ that of Smerdis the Magian usurper, and Artaxerxes the son and successor of Xerxes. Most people will be slow, I suppose, to believe this, unless it should receive support from modern research in cuneiform inscriptions or other authentic monuments of antiquity.

Nice.

EDWARD BILEY.

"MAN'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIS MENTAL BIAS."

How far is a man answerable for his mental bias? All men, confessedly, are not alike in their *mental* constitution any more than in their *moral* and *physical* constitutions. For, take any two men anywhere, both of average ability, and the tastes, inclinations, desires, tendencies of the one shall not, as a rule, be in anything like thorough harmony with those of the other. There will, most probably, not only be an expressed contrariety of opinion, but, what is far more important, a *radical* difference of disposition, the consequence of which will necessarily be that each of the two men will come to his own peculiar conclusions upon every given subject. And not only so, but, moreover, each of the two men will value any particular line of enquiry, or not,—just as he takes pleasure in its investigation, or not. The one will, perhaps, passionately devote himself to some one or more of the branches of science, *for its own sake*; the other will perhaps sneer at all science as practically worthless, because he sees not how it will bring him any present or future gain or advantage. The one will perhaps devote himself to historical or antiquarian researches, satisfied if his labours result in clearing up for posterity a disputed point, or a hitherto meaningless inscription; the other will perhaps turn from both, as equally dry and equally uninteresting, caring nothing for such things as regards himself, much less as regards posterity. Now the secret of all this marked difference of disposition between these two men is traceable to the spirit which respectively animates them. For, whereas the one will patiently investigate everything before he ventures to come to any definite opinion, will look at the subject under consideration in all its bearings, sift all evidence, impartially listen to both sides, spare no pains and no labour to arrive at the truth on any and every given subject; the other will be content to go through the world with no definite opinions at all; endorsing *this* man's views or *that* man's views, just as the whim, or caprice, or requirements of the hour seem to demand; satisfied if he can (by being all things to all men) be received as a friend (in the *worldly* sense of that word) everywhere, and by every one. I repeat then, how far is each of these two men answerable for his mental bias? It will perhaps be said that the accidents of birth, education, bringing up, profession, friends, the society into which they are respectively first intimately thrown, must be taken into

account in replying. Let it be so; let all these allowances be made in either case; and then, when this has been done, remembering that the men are of equal *average* ability, how far is each answerable for his own state of mind?

We assert that each is *thoroughly* answerable, not, be it remarked, so much for his attainments or for his opportunities (for *they* confessedly depend, in a great measure, upon *accidental* circumstances), as for the spirit, or tone, or bias of his mind. And the reason why we assert this is, that there is a fearful power inherent in each of these two men, of making himself just what he pleases, either of a wise or of a scornful spirit; that it was, at *the first*, in the power of each, *in proportion to the talents confided to him*, to stir up the gift that was in him; or to refuse altogether to trade with his talents, even though *ten* talents, and to go instead and bury them into frivolity, and dissipation, and utter worldliness.

Now let us advance the argument one step further, and see how far it holds true in a *spiritual* point of view. If there is a marked difference between men *intellectually*, certainly there is an equally marked difference between men *spiritually*. This is manifest to all, hardly needing any proof. For every man's intimate circle of acquaintance supplies it over and over again.

For some there are to whom *all* things are clear, whose "spiritual understanding" is so increased through heavenly grace imparted, and afterwards cherished, that to them every parable, every hard saying of Holy Writ, seems to unfold and declare its hidden meaning. Whereas there are others to whom nothing seems clear; whose "spiritual understanding" is so weak and clouded that (not only have they *not* increased in heavenly knowledge, but) they seem in imminent danger of letting slip, one by one, even those poor confused notions of God's truth, the lingering reminiscences of their childhood's teachings, which amidst a sensual and careless life they have yet in their remembrance.

Now how far is a man answerable for this his *spiritual* state of mind?

We assert again he is *thoroughly* answerable, that it rests with each man alone, whether he will be numbered with wise men or with scorners. For, let us not mistake or ignore the laws which govern man's spiritual development. True, the Spirit of the Highest can alone make a man "wise unto salvation." True, He alone can reveal to a man "the things" of the heavenly kingdom. But, then, God's Spirit acts only upon willing agents. He does not force men to be wise against their own will; he does not compel a man to yield assent to that which (knowing it to be a part of God's revealed truth) he wilfully persists in rejecting. For there is a fearful power inherent in every man to be, or not (as he pleases), an earnest, faithful, believing worker, together with God's Spirit working in him. So that the conclusion to which we are compelled to come, in answering the question with which we started, How far is a man answerable for his mental bias? is, that he is thoroughly

answerable in every way and in every sense, morally, mentally, intellectually, spiritually.

This being so, let us see how the argument bears upon the intellectual problem of the present day, viz., the relations of science and revelation. By science I mean (using the word conventionally) every possible branch of earthly knowledge; all that wisdom which a man can acquire by the diligent exercise of those faculties with which God has endowed him. By revelation I mean that heavenly knowledge which God has so graciously made known to us in His Holy Word in the Old Testament and in the New Testament; all that wisdom which a man cannot of himself, however wise, acquire, or by himself, however diligent, attain unto.

1. That both these sources of wisdom were equally designed to subserve man's highest, most lasting good, we assume from the existence of that ardent desire for knowledge, *for its own sake*, which is part of man's nature.

2. That both these sources were designed mutually to illustrate, and to confirm each other, we assume from the fact of both proceeding alike from the same God of truth and wisdom. For it were unphilosophical, not to say blasphemous, to suppose that when God has seen fit to reveal Himself to man, partly in the book of nature, partly in the book of Revelation, there can be any *real* contradiction of the one by the other.

3. And that both these sources were equally designed to have the same *practical* effect in humbling man to the dust by the consideration of his own individual insignificance, and by stirring up in him feelings of reverence and of awe towards the Creator and Preserver of all things, we assume from the surpassing grandeur of God's revelation of Himself in nature, and from the majestic love and compassion of God's revelation of Himself in Christ Jesus.

That these assumptions are fair and reasonable is surely evident from one consideration alone: All the pretended revelations of the heathen world are a strange medley of various operations of nature, as administered each by its own presiding deity, under the superintending control and guidance of one great Father like of gods and men. The Greek and Roman mythologies, the systems of the Hindoos and of other eastern Pagan nations, the absurd fables of our own northern forefathers, all are full of the deification of nature, as well as of One, under divers names, to whom all things in heaven and on earth were regarded by them as subject. And as thus the book of nature *alone* could lead these heathen men thus to seek after God, if haply they might feel after Him, and find Him, surely that same book of nature is intended to be *nevertheless* studied by us, as the supplement to that other, and better and more perfect revelation, which it is our privilege and our fearful responsibility as Christian men, to possess.

Yet say some (who ought to know better) that these two sources of wisdom—the one earthly, the other heavenly—are incapable of being harmonized: and so the result is, that whilst some discard

revelation altogether, or explain away many of its leading facts, others look upon science with suspicion, and will hardly tolerate those who plead for its recognition as the *earthly* supplement to things Divine.

Now, surely, it is both mischievous and false thus to place in direct opposition the discoveries of science, and the declarations of Holy Writ. Mischievous, because it is sure to turn men either into bigots or into sceptics: false, because the history of the past teaches us, that though again and again the reading of the book of nature has for awhile *appeared* to contradict the Divine word, yet, in the end, all such conflicts have invariably ended in the triumphant vindication of Holy Writ; its *apparent* discrepancies with the book of nature being proved to be but the result of too hasty conclusions, which have vanished, as they ever *will* vanish, before a wider induction and a more patient investigation.

The error then is man's, in his reading of the book of nature, not the inspired writer's, in his record of infallible truth. Had men come with teachable hearts, and humble spirits, and impartial minds, to the sacred oracles; had they but felt in the words of the great moralist (Bishop Butler), the "obligation of searching Scripture in order to see what the scheme of revelation *really* is, instead of determining beforehand from reason what the scheme of it *must* be," we should not now be called upon to defend the verities of revelation against the insidious attacks of those who have been led away captives by a vain philosophy. For it would have been readily admitted by all alike, that though revelation does not profess to *teach* science, it never contradicts or even misrepresents any one of its facts. We say this advisedly after long, and calm, and careful consideration; for it is a grievous error to regard the language which Scripture uses when speaking of any of the phenomena of nature, as adapted to the narrow ideas of the early ages of the world. The language of Scripture does *nowhere* thus stoop to the errors, and prejudices, and ignorance of men. *Everywhere*, when touching upon the phenomena of nature, does it speak in the language of every-day life, in that very language which the most scientific men of the present day employ when alluding to the facts of science in ordinary intercourse.

The complaint, then, which is now so often urged by many, not merely that the scriptural account of physical phenomena is imperfect, but moreover that wrong notions respecting them are therein taught, arises from that "smattering of philosophy" which, to use the words of Lord Bacon, the great factor of inductive teaching, "leads on to Atheism," whereas a thorough acquaintance with it brings (a man) back again "to religion." For to quote the words of one of the greatest of living philosophers, "The character of the *true* philosopher is to hope all things not impossible, and to believe all things not unreasonable."

And surely there is nothing in *itself* impossible or unreasonable

^a Sir J. Herschel.

which we are called upon in Scripture to believe. For it must be remembered that the phenomena of nature can always be set before us (as it were) in *two* languages, either in the exact language of science, or in the language of appearances, *i.e.*, in that language in which ordinary men, unversed in scientific terms, would seek to describe what they have seen. Both are equally real, both equally true. The latter, the language of appearances, *i.e.*, the language of the sense as opposed to the language of theory, is that which is invariably employed in Scripture. And the condescension to the infirmities of the great majority of men thus manifestly displayed, instead of begetting in any of the wiser amongst us a scornful scepticism, should rather lead us in all lowly reverence and in all real humility to ask, with the son of Sirach, "To whom hath the *root* of wisdom been revealed, or who hath known her wise counsels? There is, *one* wise and greatly to be feared, the Lord sitting upon His throne."

Nice.

E. J. M.

ON THE MEANING OF 1 TIM. II. 15; 1 TIM. VI. 2;
2 TIM. III. 8; AND 2 TIM. IV. 17.

1 TIM. ii. 13-15. Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη, κίττα ἔβρα; καὶ Ἄδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη; ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἠπατηθεῖσα, ἐν παραβάσει ἡγήσθη. Σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, εἰν μένουσαν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἀγαπᾷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης. "For Adam was first formed, then Eve, and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in a transgression; but she shall be saved through child-bearing, if they remain in faith and love and sanctification, with temperance."

It is rather surprising that the first part of verse 14 should have created much difficulty, the words, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman;" yet so it is. Schleiermacher considers the words as an argument against its Pauline character. He cannot think that the stress which is laid on the fact that Adam was created first, nor the way in which the first sin is attributed to Eve rather than to Adam, can be reconciled with what St. Paul says in 1 Cor. xi. 11, and in Rom. v. 12, etc. In Rom. v. 12, the sin of disobedience is laid upon Adam. Here, on the other hand, the woman is made responsible; and Adam by inference freed from the *παράβασις*. But this is only an instance how supposed difficulties in the Scripture text are magnified, if not raised, from want of consideration of that which the writer really says. In this place the Apostle is urging submission on the part of the woman towards the man. He cites the history of the first creation of mankind, that the man was prior to the woman in the order in which they were formed. And, moreover, he gives a reason why: "the woman should learn in silence with all subjection." The woman had shown a weakness which the man had not. The woman was deceived, the man was not. The whole stress of the comparison is to be laid on the *ἠπατήθη ἠπατηθεῖσα*. There is nothing which contradicts that which St. Paul says in respect to

Adam being the cause of death to his race. He is the head of the whole family, and to him as such is ascribed the first sin of disobedience, though, in fact, the account in Genesis tells us Eve was tempted first and fell. But the point which the Apostle in the passage under consideration insists on is that Eve was *deceived*, Adam was not. Adam sinned, and his sin affected his whole race, of which he is the head; but he was not beguiled by the serpent as Eve was. In the Mosaic account of the fall is *ἀνδρὶ* only applied to the woman, not to the man. She says expressly, Gen. iii. 13, ὁ ὄφις ἠπάτησέ με, but the man makes use of no such expression. It might be, indeed, that Adam's sin was of a deeper kind, as being a more determined disobedience, a sinning with his eyes open, without being deceived. All he says in excuse was, "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat;" whereas the woman's plea is, "the serpent beguiled me." The writer, therefore, is speaking in exact accordance with the narrative in Genesis, when he says, Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη, ἡ δὲ ἡμεῖς ἀπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονε. It is wonderful then that this passage should have excited difficulty, and marvellous that it should be used in evidence against the non-Pauline origin of this Epistle. The words that follow offer more difficulty. "But she shall be saved through child-bearing, if they remain in faith and charity and holiness, with temperance." "Be saved," σωθήσεται, must of course here be taken in the sense in which it is commonly used in the New Testament; it stands in opposition to what was just before said of the woman, ἐν παραβάσει γέγονε. How τεκνογονία (which word only occurs in this place in the New Testament) stands in relation to σωτήρια, is a question which has been answered by some commentators by reference to that which is connected only with it, viz., the education and training of children. So Chrysostom and Theophylact. "By childbirth he means, not the bearing of children only, but the bringing them in a godly way." And this is the interpretation of some moderns. But τεκνογονία is not the same as τεκνοτρόφειν. The meaning of the Apostle seems simply to be this:—As the woman had been guilty of a particular *παράβασις* in the easiness with which she had been tempted and deceived, and had believed the serpent's word rather than God's; so had her sex inherited a peculiar punishment. The stress is laid, in Gen. iii. 16, on "the sorrow" or pain which should accompany childbirth, which should be ever afterwards its distinguishing mark (cf. St. John xvi. 21). This should be the peculiar punishment of the woman over and above what she bore as partaker of Adam's nature, viz., death. This should stand against her peculiar weakness, shewn in the fact that she ἠπατήθη. And this peculiar punishment should serve, at the same time, to remind her of her proper place, as subject to the man. The Apostle brings in the σωθήσεται διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας as a comfort to the woman after what had been said immediately before, and also in support of the rule he had laid down in verse 11. He enforces the truth, that a woman was acting in accordance with God's will when she occupied

signify the state where the slavery was, or might be, oppressive. The word *ζυγός* does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament as spoken of the yoke of slavery. (Herodotus has the expression *δοῦλιον ζυγόν*.) The case is supposed where the heathen master is cognizant of the fact that his slave is a Christian. Otherwise the warning would not be in place. *ὅνα μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ διδασκαλία βλασφημῇται*. The thought here expressed Chrysostom gives rightly, "The unbeliever, if he should see the slaves, on account of the faith, behaving them in a disrespectful way; will accuse (*βλασφημῆσαι*) oftentimes the faith as the cause of disobedience; but if he sees the slaves obedient, is more likely to be persuaded, more likely himself to give heed to the things spoken." Not simply absolute obedience, such as a slave would be obliged to pay to his master, is enjoined in the Apostle's rule, but even honour, respect, *τιμή*. In this is tacitly forbidden that proud, self-sufficient spirit which would be so ruinous to the spiritual condition of the Christian slave, and to which his position offered such strong temptation; the temper of disdain and contempt towards his master, as one so inferior to himself in real privileges, though superior in worldly condition. And few positions are so trying to the temper of Christian humility and contentment as for a man to find himself in an inferior worldly state and rank to another to whom he feels himself morally and intellectually a superior. This danger is guarded against by the exhortation to regard their masters as worthy *κύριος τιμῆς*. And now having given directions respecting the case of heathen master and Christian slave, the Apostle speaks of the other, when both were Christians. Here the danger of doing a wrong to the teaching of Christianity was scarcely less. There a slave might be wanting in due respect by reason of his master's heathenism; here he might take advantage of the real, though not outward, equality which belonged to Christians as such, to defraud him of the respect due to his position. He might wish to treat his master as on an equal social position, because, spiritually, they were equal. This would be *καταφρονεῖν*, to treat him slightly, because both were *ἀδελφοί*. It was in this case more difficult than in the other to keep up the notion of the one being *κύριος τιμῆς*. And yet the Apostle says that on the very account that they were brethren, were believers, should the Christian slaves pay them more service. That is the force of the *μᾶλλον δουλεύετασσι: μᾶλλον*—"so much the more." And then the meaning of the last clause will be more plain. Our English version here has not rendered the meaning of the original by the translation, by, "because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit," i.e., of the benefit of having been made Christians like these slaves. But it is evident from the use and position of the article that "partakers of the benefit" cannot be in apposition to "faithful and beloved;" *οἱ ἀντιλαμβ.* is the subject of the sentence, and the *οἱ* are the masters, while "faithful and beloved" is the predicate. If this be so, then the *ἐνεργείας* does not mean the grace of redemption, the benefit of having been made Christians; but *ἐνεργείας* refers to the

benefit which the slaves are the more to render their masters because they are believers. So the meaning of the latter clause will be, "but let them the more pay service of slaves to them, because they who partake of the benefit are faithful and beloved," i.e., the slaves, so far from taking advantage of their masters being Christians, should pay them the required service with the greater zeal, because those who receive such service at their hands are Christians. The word *ἀνταρβανόμεναι* does not, it is true, occur elsewhere in this sense in the New Testament. In Luke i. 54, Acts xx. 35, it means to help, assist; and in classical Greek it signifies, generally, to devote oneself to a subject, e.g., τῆς φιλοσοφίας, τῶν πραγμάτων; so also Isaiah xvi. 18 in Septuagint, ἀνταρβανόμενοι ἀληθείας, i.e., veritatis studiosus, and has rather an active than passive sense. But here it can only mean "receiving, partaking in." And that of which they are partakers is the benefit derived from the faithful, respectful δουλεία of those who are in spirit their brethren. With this exhortation the Apostle closes this part of his subject, "These things do and teach;" which is to be referred to what has gone before, not to what follows.

2 Tim. iii. 8, Ὁν τρόπον δὲ Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντίστησαν Μωϋσῇ, οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. "But in the manner that Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these men withstand the truth." The first point for consideration is, whether we are to take the words ὁν τρόπον quite strictly? The persons named Jannes and Jambres were no doubt two of the magicians who withstood Moses, and used, in opposition to the miracles performed by him, magical, or pretended magical, arts. Does the Apostle mean that the false teachers at Ephesus against whom St. Paul is warning Timothy were sorcerers, as the opponents of Moses were at the court of Pharaoh? Many modern commentators lay the stress on the ἀντίστησαν, and consider that the point of resemblance between the Egyptian magicians and the Ephesian false teachers lay in their both opposing themselves to the truth and to God's messenger. But though no doubt the opposition to the truth is a prominent part of the likeness which the Apostle finds between the two, this interpretation would leave out the full meaning of the word *τρόπον*, "manner." It seems that in the persons themselves; and in the arts they used, there was a resemblance, as well as in their opposition to the truth. And there is no reason to deny, but rather every ground for maintaining the existence of magical arts, or conjuring tricks which looked like magical arts in the time of the Apostles. In verse 13 of this chapter these false teachers are called *γοητεῖς*, which, though translated in our version "seducers," means, of course, properly "sorcerers." Then, again, we find in Acts viii. 9, Simon described as *ὁ μαγικῶν καὶ ἐπιστάντων τὸ ἐθνόν*, and a little after, at verse 11, the arts by which he deluded and astonished the people are called *μαγεία*. So also we read at Acts xiii. 6, of Barjesus or Elymas who practised the arts of a *μαγός* at the court of the pro-consul Sergius Paulus. But of course the strongest passage is Acts xix., where we read of persons

who used the arts of sorcery in the very city Ephesus, where *γοῖτροι* still existed at the time St. Paul wrote this letter. The persons there are spoken of as *τὰ τέλεια μαγείας*, practising "curious arts," as our version has it (though "magical arts" would have been perhaps the better rendering), following here the Vulgate, which has "*qui fuerant curiosi sectantes.*" Ephesus, as is well known, was famous or infamous for the practice of sorcery. The *Ἐφεσίων γράμματα* are mentioned by Plutarch, *Symp.*, lib. vii., quest. 5, "The magicians command those possessed with devils to call over themselves, and to repeat the Ephesian letters." And Eustathius gives the reason of the name: "Ephesian letters," charms, by means of which some have been saved from great dangers, and overcome trials. They are certain words upon the garland, or girdle, or the feet of the Ephesian Artemis (*Diana*, cf. Acts xix. 34), written in an enigmatical way, from whence that which is written obscurely is called "Ephesian letters." See for the quotations Clemens Alex., *Strom.*, i. 132, and *Strom.*, v., 568. With this evidence for the prevalence of magical arts at Ephesus, we may conclude that when the Apostle compares the false teachers there to the Egyptian magicians, he has in mind *γοῖτροι*, sorcerers, who used the same kind of arts in resisting the truth which their forerunners had done at the court of Pharaoh. And there is no reason, but the contrary, for leaving out this point of comparison in the interpretation of this verse. Whether they were Jews or Gentiles who withstood the truth in this manner in Ephesus, we have no means of knowing. But it is most probable they were partial converts from heathenism, who, in the temper of Simon Magus their prototype, thought some gain would accrue to themselves from a profession of Christianity; and when they were disappointed in that hope, became its bitter opposers. They might wish to withstand the truth, as the Egyptian magicians had done, by seeking to imitate the miracles done by Christians, and setting up their own curious arts in opposition to the cures and wonders wrought. It is, moreover, most likely they were heathens rather than Jews, as Ephesus was peculiarly a heathen city, and one in which idolatry was rampant. And the practice of magical arts was so abhorrent to the Jews, that none but the most degraded would be likely to use them. We may regard it then as most probable that the false teachers who exercised such a baneful influence on society in Ephesus were professors of sorcery. And so are they with greater force compared to the magicians Jaanes and Mambres, who opposed Moses. Different suggestions have been offered as to the source from which St. Paul learnt the names of these two persons. Origen and Ambrose suppose the Apostle found them in an apocryphal book, *Jaanes et Mambres Liber*. Chrysostom observes, "Either he received them from an unwritten tradition; or it is likely Paul learnt them from the Spirit." And in the opinion that the Apostle derived his information on this point from Jewish tradition (which is the most probable notion), Theodoret coincides, who says, "The divine Apostle did not learn the names from Holy Scripture, but from the

unwritten teaching of the Jews." According to a Jewish tradition Jamnes and Mambres were the sons of Balaam, and had originally been the teachers of Moses, and afterwards became his bitterest opponents. Origen (*Contro. Celsum*, iv., 51) and Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.*, ix., 8) tell us that a Pythagorean philosopher, named Numenius, makes mention of the history of Moses, and of Jambræ and Mamres. If so, this information might be derived from books then in existence, and these books would contain the traditional history. St. Paul mentions the names as familiar to Timothy, who had been so carefully taught the Old Testament from his youth, and no doubt was well acquainted with all the writings and traditions among his countrymen in any way connected with the sacred history.

2 Tim. iv. 17, *Kai êph'athyn êk στόματος λέοντος*. "And I was saved from the mouth of a lion." This expression there can be no doubt is to be understood metaphorically: though Meshim took it literally, and supposed the Apostle is here referring to the punishment of being thrown to the lions. But there is no evidence that in the Apostle's time any Christian was subjected to this punishment. And, as it is agreed that St. Paul was, at last, beheaded, it is most improbable that he was ever exposed to this manner of death. Taking the expression as metaphorical, what is the meaning of it? The usual explanation is, that by the lion is meant Nero. This is the interpretation given by Chrysostom, and others have followed him in it. Pearson indeed does not think that Nero is meant, but his deputy, Helius Casaræanus, as (he observes) Nero was at that time absent from Rome, on a journey into Greece. But if any person be intended by the *λέων*, to none could the term apply better than to Nero, on account of his cruelty and sternness, as Chrysostom says. But it is hardly likely that any single person is meant by the word; and it would not be applicable at all to a number, as Wolf, for instance, has supposed, "*Omnis illa hostium caterva, quorum conatus in prima apologia tunc facta eluserit*." The interpretation which Estius and many modern commentators give is, on the whole, the best. They understand the expression "lion's mouth" as a general or proverbial one for any great danger, as we say, "from the jaws of death." The Apostle is therefore speaking simply of his deliverance from very imminent peril of death, and he goes on to express his confident belief that God would still defend him from every evil work, i. e., from all harm to soul and body which his enemies might seek to inflict on him. Calvin gives here the same explanation as Estius. He says, "*hæc locutione generaliter periculum designari existimo; ac si diceret: ex presenti incendio, vel ex faucibus mortis*." H. D.

RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD.

It is well known that great difficulty is felt in the attempt to reconcile the different accounts in the Gospels of our Lord's resurrection. Dean Alford says, "On the chronology of the events of the resurrection I attempt no harmony of the accounts. I believe all such attempts to be fruitless" (*Greek Test.*, note on John xx. 1). Perhaps the following arrangement, which I found amongst the papers of the late Rev. Hen. Craik, of Bristol, may be valued by some of your readers.

W. ELFE TAYLOR.

The details in the four Evangelists seem in some degree to differ. I would arrange the order of events as follows:—

1.—Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, etc., etc., come very early to the sepulchre. Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1, 2; Luke xxiv. 1.

2.—Mary Magdalene appears to have outrun the others, and to have preceded them at the sepulchre. John xx. 1.

3.—She finds the stone removed and the body taken away, and without waiting with the others for the message of the angel, she immediately runs back and informs Peter. John xx. 2.

4.—In consequence of what Peter heard from Mary Magdalene, he and John ran onward to the sepulchre. John xx. 3—10.

5.—During her absence, the angels appear to the other women, and inform them of the fact of the resurrection of Jesus. Matt. xxviii. 5; Mark xvi. 5, 7; Luke xxiv. 5—8.

6.—They go forth to tell the disciples, and Mary Magdalene, as before-stated, returning with Peter and John, while the others are on their way. Matt. xxviii. 8; Mark xvi. 7, 8; Luke xxiv. 9.

7.—Jesus appears first to Mary Magdalene alone as she stood weeping near the sepulchre. John xx. 11—18.

8.—Jesus subsequently appears to the other women as they were on their way to tell the disciples. Matt. xxviii. 9.

Thus the apparent discrepancies are almost entirely reconciled; we have only to make allowance for the omissions in one account being filled up by that which is supplied in another. It is remarkable that Luke distinctly intimates that there was a little interval between the discovery of the absence of the body of Jesus and the vision of the angels. During this little interval Mary appears to have run back before the others, not being able to give any fuller account than that "they had taken away her Lord, and she knew not where they had laid him."

The other women could have added, "that they had seen also a vision of angels, which had said that he was alive."

JOHN X. 10.

The true view of a part of John x. 10. has been missed, I cannot but think, by most interpreters. Our Authorized Version is as follows:—"I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." This rendering fails to draw out and set forth a part of the important contrasts which the passage contains, and so fails to display a part of the exceeding goodness of our only Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The word "*it*," observe, is in italics, there being nothing to correspond to it in the Greek. περισσόν *ἐχειν* means "*to have superabundance*." See Liddell and Scott under περισσόν. And now note the contrasts. "The thief cometh not but for (i.) *to steal*, and (ii.) *to kill and to destroy*." "I came" (i.) [not to kill and to destroy, but] "*that they might have life*, and" (ii.) [not to rob and deprive them, but] "*that they might have a superabundance*" [of all that they need, not of life only, and beyond all that ever entered into the heart of man to conceive]. Such are the unsearchable riches of his loving-kindness, such the provision made by the good Shepherd for his sheep.

The discourse arose in the question of the Pharisees: "Are we blind also?" The Lord's answer, as his answers often did on other occasions, sets forth general truths, which include the particular case before him, and it implies thus much: "You are blind leaders of the blind, and those who follow you will perish. And you are in reality mercenaries, not true pastors of the flock. You serve yourselves, and destroy the sheep. I am the door of the fold: those who enter in by me shall be saved. I am the good shepherd, who *give my life for the sheep*. Unless you believe on me, and yourselves enter the fold through me, you cannot be even of the flock of God, much less pastors of that flock." Some difficulties in the interpretation of the whole passage will be avoided by observing that verses 1—5 are a *parable* (here indeed called *παροιμία*, not *παραβολή*), and that verses 6, etc., are the explanation of it, as in Matt. xiii. verses 3—8 are the parable, and verses 18—23 the explanation.

EDWARD BILEY.

THE PHRASE "AGERE PŒNITENTIAM."

I was surprised, on looking out "Hermas," in my copy of Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, at finding the following statement: "By these three means—visions, commands, and similes—the author endeavours to shew that a godly life consists in observing the commands of God and *doing penance*." On referring to the Latin of Hermas's *Pastor* I found the phrase "*agere pœnitentiam*" was in frequent use, and that the writer in Smith's *Dictionary* had fallen into the inexcusable error of mistaking "*agere pœnitentiam*" for aught but the Latin equivalent of *μετάνοια*, "*to repent*." On further referring to the portion of the Greek text preserved in the *Codex Sinaiticus*, I found that the Greek

μετανοειν corresponded in every place to the Latin "agere poenitentiam." A father of the antiquity and former renown of Hermas ought not to be thus misrepresented in a work of such circulation and with such pretensions to scholarship as Smith's *Dictionary*.

A. H. W.

THE DAYS OF GENESIS I.

ALLOW me to add a few words to the article on the "Days" of Genesis i., to which you gave admittance in your number for January last.

The same phrase "Let the earth bring forth," which is found in i. 11, occurs again in verse 24. "Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind." When, however, the result of this fiat of the Almighty Creator is described, it is not said, as in the case of the vegetation on the third day, "And the earth brought forth," but "And God made the living creature of the earth," etc. The reason of its being said in this last case, "Let the earth bring forth," is probably to signify what is more fully said afterwards, ii. 19, "Out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field," etc., i.e., that they are "of the earth, earthy."

EDWARD BILEY.

PER CHRISTUM DOMINUM NOSTRUM.

I SHALL feel much obliged by your allowing me to ask through your Journal, whether any reason can be assigned for the *period* before the above expression, as found in the R. Missal, and in the Latin prayers in the Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth, 1560 (Parker Society), having been changed into a *colon* or *semi-colon*, as found in the English Liturgies of King Edward VI. (Parker Society), and in our present English Church Prayer Book? In the Private Prayers (English) of Queen Elizabeth, 1578 (Parker), we find the *period* retained before "Through Jesus Christ our Lord." It will be generally allowed, I suppose, that in all cases, except where the context points out a different sense, where the above short Latin expression is used, some such word as "Oramus" is understood; and if so, "Through Jesus Christ our Lord" means "We offer up this prayer in the name of Jesus Christ," or some such expression to that effect, in obedience to John xv. 16. If so, it forms a sentence by itself; yet we not unfrequently hear clergymen read it as if it formed a part of the previous sentence, which often alters the sense very materially; as in the Prayers for Rain, Fair Weather—also in the Collects for Grace, and for the First, Second, and Third Sundays after Trinity, etc., etc. If the period had been retained in our English Prayer Book they could not well fall into that error.

Mossley.

JAMES BRIERLEY.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Les Religions et les Philosophies dans l'Asie Centrale. Par le Comte de Gobineau. Deuxième édition. Paris : Didier.

ALL our civilisation, Count de Gobineau remarks in starting, comes from the East. *Ex Oriente lux.* There is scarcely a form of thought, a metaphysical doctrine for which we are not indebted to Asia. If we add to this fact the other no less undoubted one, that our intercourse with the Oriental world is gaining ground every day, and that in a very short time it will become both politically and commercially of first-rate importance, we shall at once see the desirableness of being more thoroughly acquainted than we are now with the manners, the feelings, the philosophical, religious, and literary views of the Asiatics. Such is the subject of Count de Gobineau's book, and he has discussed it with all the fullness and the accuracy which might be expected from a gentleman who has been long a resident in Eastern climes.

Our author begins by pointing out the difference which exists between the European habits of thought and those of the inhabitants of Asia:—

"When a European," he says, "embraces a doctrine, his intellect very naturally leads him to discard everything that does not belong to it—everything, at least, that would form with it too great a contrast. Not that such an operation is either easy or simple. He may, without much difficulty, indeed, find out that black and white are incompatible, and that, if we would have the one colour in all its purity, the other must disappear; but the mind has seldom the necessary energy to render the separation as absolute as it should be; in most cases we retain a little of the opinion which we had cast aside. In the case of clear and precise declarations, we may reject such and such dogmas; but it is not so easy to withdraw ourselves from the consequences of these dogmas, from ideas which would not exist if they themselves had no reality; in short the number of consciences which are either decidedly white or decidedly black is everywhere exceedingly rare; the grey ones are those which we most usually meet."

Count de Gobineau acknowledges readily that Europeans are of all men those who have best succeeded in adopting apparently homogeneous doctrines, and, by way of contrast, he shews us the people of the East fond of antinomies, revelling in a kind of intellectual gymnastics which could not but drive them, in course of time, to scepticism or indifference.

"They excel, as people say, in splitting a hair into four parts, and of these four intangible quantities they will construct a bridge strong enough to bear a carriage; the most trifling idea supplies them with food for endless meditations. At the same time it is certain that that moral faculty which we call *common sense* . . . does not perfectly counterbalance their imaginative power, and their rapidity of conception; to tell the truth, they are entirely deficient in common sense, and this want is very apparent in their way of transacting any kind of business."

To sum up the above appreciation of the Eastern character, we may say that their extreme fondness for metaphysical investigation leads them to attach the same importance to all theories indiscriminately, as

long as they afford food for disputation. Their catholicity of spirit is really a deeply seated scepticism. In the meanwhile every man belongs to some positive religion, Jew, Christian, Mahometan, Hindu, fire-worshipper.—As he was born, so he dies. Conversions from one creed to another are extremely rare; and if a Jew, for instance, happens to embrace the faith of the Koran, his children, nine times out of ten, return to the religion which the father had forsaken.

After having thus sketched the broad lines of demarcation between the populations of the East and those of the West, Count de Gobineau goes on to describe the principal features of Persian Islamism, and of that form of Chaldaism which constitutes the religion of the Arabs. The different other religious elements which are to be found in Asia then attract his notice: of the Christians he has very little to say, and that is most unfavourable; the Jews, on the contrary, are praised by him for the energy of their faith, their zeal and their intellectual qualities:—

"The Jews do not deserve that contempt. The majority amongst them, no doubt, are exclusively absorbed by their material interests, and they offer that external *laissez-aller*, that untidiness which has everywhere prevented them from exciting sympathy or inspiring esteem; but in Asia as well as in other localities they have the moral energy, the religious pride which raises them above so many catastrophes; and which we find united in some of them with a lively interest for their dogmas, their literature, their sciences. It is Jewish books which the European printing-presses have chiefly sent to Asia during the last hundred years. These volumes may be met with in rather large numbers; and there is no Hebrew community, be it ever so small, in the most insignificant towns, that does not possess Venetian or Leghorn editions of the most essential works. Nothing of the kind can be said respecting the Christian Churches. Some of the Jewish doctors are deeply read in the Talmudic books, and in metaphysical literature. I was struck with real astonishment the day when one of those *savants* spoke to me with admiration of Spinoza, and asked me for information on the doctrines of Kant. These names, these ideas—glimpses of other ideas which we might suppose to be unknown to them, reach them through the medium of the works which they procure chiefly from Germany, and the principal *entrepôt* of which is at Bagdad. Distances do not prevent them from holding intercourse with one another. As far as dogmatic interests are concerned, and niceties of doctrine or questions of civil law, they are in constant communication with the chief Rabbi of Jerusalem, who, designated in their official style under the name of "King of Jerusalem," decides sovereignly on all controverted points. His opinion has force of law, and is never impugned. Thoroughly acquainted with the names and opinions of their most influential European brethren, the Jews inhabiting India and Persia are visited by missionaries or rather collectors who beg from them in favour of the Jews residing at Jerusalem, alms which are never refused. It was by the means of those itinerant collectors that news formerly circulated. At the present day the Jews likewise employ occasionally the means of communication which are at the disposal of Europeans, and which are more frequent and more rapid, if not safer. Not only do their correspondences treat of national questions or of commercial affairs, they embrace also the discussion of doctrinal points, and the exchange of literary productions sometimes, though rarely, in the Hebrew language properly so called, sometimes in the Aramean or Chaldean idiom and with great pretensions to elegancies of style. These compositions are not always of a serious character. A few months ago the learned Jews of Teheran were occupied with a poetical satire, by them considered as admirable, and which had been written by a Rabbi at Jerusalem."

It appears from M. de Gobineau's account, that the doctrine of the

Sufis enjoys a great amount of popularity still in the East; nor is such a fact astonishing when we think for a moment of the social and political condition of that part of the world. Amidst a population subject to the caprice of despotic sovereigns, where property is not safe, where no man is sure that within a few hours he will not be put to death in order to satisfy the revenge or even the merest whim of a Pasha, that theory must be extremely congenial which teaches the unreality of this present world, the absorption of all things in the bosom of the Deity, and the positive advantage of complete quietism. The Sufis have obtained converts amongst all the classes of Eastern society.

"Their means of action," says Count de Gobineau, "are perfect. They have their chiefs, their councils, their monks, their missionaries; and the stages of the doctrine they inculcate are so numerous that there is room for intellects of every degree of culture. The wise men of the sect, the *Urafas*, measure science to each one according to the strength or the weakness of his mind. If they perceive that one of their maxims scandalizes a neophyte, they have always at their disposal a double meaning which enables them to convince the timid disciple that he was wrong in his objections. If, on the contrary, they perceive that the theological stomach of the proselyte is robust, they feed him upon speculations most hard to digest."

M. de Gobineau gives us an interesting list of the principal Sufis, and he shews at the same time that even so comprehensive a system of Pantheism, so thoroughly unencumbered by the trammels of positive religion, was not enough for Eastern philosophers. The contact of European ideas ended by inoculating them with all the vagaries of modern transcendentalism, and their favourite authors are now Hegel and Spinoza—the very philosophers whose theories are most in accordance with Eastern modes of thought.

One of the most curious parts in Count de Gobineau's extremely valuable book is that which concerns the sect of the Bábis. About the year 1848 there lived at Shyrax in Persia a young man, Mirza-Aly-Mohammed, who was thought to be descended from Mahomet, and who, at the age of nineteen began a religious movement destined to spread throughout the whole of central Asia. By his piety, his zeal, his talents, he soon drew around him a number of eager followers, and a small church was formed. He then assumed the title of Báb, thus pointing out to himself as to the *door* by which alone men can attain unto the knowledge of God.

In his recently published work, *Les Apôtres*, pp. 378—380, M. Renan speaks of that "homme doux et sans aucune prétention, une sorte de Spinoza modeste et pieux, élevé, presque malgré lui, au rang de thaumaturge, d'incarnation divine." Such was the Báb. His attempt roused, of course, the indignation and the hatred of all true followers of the Prophet, and Bâhyem met with the usual fate of most religious reforms; it was violently persecuted. The antagonists of the new movement thought that the death of Mirza-Aly-Mohammed would bring about the dispersion of his followers; they were completely mistaken. The terrible massacres of 1852 have only tended to strengthen the Bábis.

Without entering here upon a full description of the doctrines held

by the disciples of the Bâb, we may simply characterize them as a system of emanation very much like that of the Gnostics and the Neo-Platonists. Their God produces this sublunary universe through his word and through the various manifestations of that word represented by seven letters or expressions. As letters these signs are the source of all visible substances; as expressions they originate merely intellectual qualities. We fall here into the reveries of the Kabbala, and the combinations of numbers which the Bâbis make so much of remind us also of Saint Martin's favourite theories.

M. de Gobineau supplies us with the most valuable information respecting the religious books of the new sect, and he thinks that Bâbysm should not be assimilated to the clumsy attempts made at various times by impostors, both in Asia and in Europe, for the purpose of deceiving the simple and leading the ignorant astray. The concluding chapters of the book are devoted to an account of dramatic literature in Persia, and a curious appendix gives us the French translations of one of the standard treatises amongst the Bâbis, namely the *Book of Precepts*. From an attentive perusal of that document the reader will obtain a tolerable idea of the doctrines inculcated by the Bâb, and he will be able to estimate in a certain measure the merits of the new religion. M.

Mahomet et le Coran, précédé d'une introduction sur les devoirs mutuels de la philosophie et de la religion. Par J. BARTHELEMY SAINT HILAIRE, Membre de l'Institut. Paris: Didier.

M. BARTHELEMY SAINT HILAIRE's articles in the *Journal des Savants* are as interesting as they are varied. India and Greece, Mussulman civilization and Vedic law,—he touches upon everything, and we may truly say of him *nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*. The volume we are now introducing to our readers is the reprint of a series of essays which were published in 1863 and 1864, and which appeared originally as reviews of the well-known monographs composed by Mess. Muir, Sprenger, and Caussin de Perceval. To these papers, carefully revised, and in many instances developed, M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire has added a summary of the life of Mahomet, taken from the *Sirat-el-Rasul*, extracts from the Koran, and, above all, a very remarkable preface, which we purpose noticing at some length. The subject is the often discussed and not yet settled one of the mutual duties of religion and philosophy. Let us give in the author's own words the principal propositions he endeavours to establish.

1. The object of philosophy and of religion is identical. The means by which that object is attained constitute the sole difference, philosophy being cultivated only by a few isolated minds, whereas religion is accepted and upheld by whole nations. Philosophy is like an individual religion; religion is the philosophy of nations.

2. Religion is the reign of authority; philosophy is the boundless domain of freedom, authority and freedom being equally indispensable

for the prosperity of communities. Hence the dogmatic immobility of the former, and the perpetually progressive mobility of the latter.

3. Philosophy and religion are sisters; and those who pretend to eliminate the one for the benefit of the other entertain a project fraught with danger. Reason and faith should co-exist peacefully, if those who are respectively identified with them know how to be just and tolerant.

4. Finally, spiritualist philosophy should bear towards Christianity more than the respect which in all times and in all places is due to every religion. Its admiration for the Christian doctrine should be the deepest and the most sincere. It is not the part of philosophy to defend Christianity, but philosophy would be renouncing itself if it joined hands with the enemies of the faith.

Such are M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire's conclusions, and the reader will notice at once the cardinal error which runs through them. Why, we repeat, why represent philosophy and religion as necessarily following two paths distinct from one another? Why separate the philosopher from the Christian? Bossuet and Malebranche, Thomas Aquinas and Peter Lombard, were certainly metaphysicians of no common repute; were they on that account the less consistent Christians? If we believe, as we ought to do, the great principles of religion, we must admit a certain number of facts and truths which unaided philosophy cannot grasp, which reason alone is bound to reject. Now, on the supposition that M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire's statement is correct, a philosopher although ignoring these facts may still feel that he is possessed of the whole truth. But is that possible?

We shall borrow one more quotation from our author in connection with the subject we are now examining. "At the bottom religion and philosophy have the same end. For, are the problems investigated by metaphysicians different from those with which religion busies itself? can they be different? To contemplate the world and man, and to explain them; what else can one do?"

We would answer that a mere speculative knowledge of man is not enough, even for philosophers. If we have attained a thorough acquaintance with our own heart, we must feel the necessity of our reconciliation with God, and that is what philosophy is incapable of doing. At that point the path of metaphysics, to follow M. Saint Hilaire's simile, must join that of religion, and metaphysicians must be content to walk on the same track as those whom M. Renan so superciliously calls *les parties simples de l'humanité*. If then we are awakened to a sense either of our estrangement from God or of the salvation which has been wrought for us, is it conceivable that we should not enjoy prayer both public and private, notwithstanding the following singular remark of M. Saint Hilaire:—"Thus then the philosopher does not rigorously bind himself down to public worship, however respectable it may be; and he should abstain from private worship, which would be in his case childishness, if not sacrilege. On the other hand, regular worship is necessary and beneficent for nations whom it supports, enlightens, and strengthens."

As far, then, as the respective positions of reason and faith are concerned we differ entirely from M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire. We readily acknowledge, at the same time, the liberality of his views, and we by no means confound him with the Naigeons and the Lamettries of former days, or with the Comtes and the Proudhons of our own.

"It is radically false," he says in an eloquent passage, "as a matter of fact, that mankind has cast away the supposed toys of its infancy, or that it wishes now to give up religion. In Asia the Hindu, the Mussulman, the Buddhist, and other populations are as tenacious of their faiths and as convinced of it as they have ever been. To take an instance more familiar to us, is the France in which we live less religious than it was during the last century? No doubt, religion might exercise amongst us a far greater empire than it does now; it might touch the soul more deeply; but the multitudes are not ready to abandon it, even for the revelations of criticism. Far from becoming weaker, religious belief makes every day happy and constant progress. If we may judge by many symptoms, a very slight amount of provocation would lead it to manifest itself suddenly by one of those spontaneous and irresistible outbursts which are so familiar to the *furia Francese* in religious as well as in other struggles."

M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire, then, although a philosopher, is a firm believer in the powerful effects of religion, and in its permanent character; let us now see how he applies his theory to the particular case of Mahomet.

The prophet of Islam, he begins by saying, has not yet been generally judged as he ought to be. If we would become thoroughly acquainted with the nature of his mission, we must cast away a number of popular prejudices which still disfigure the historical text-books commonly used.

"There are at the present time," our author remarks, "more than one hundred million of Mahometans. They may be found scattered about from Morocco in Africa to the foot of the Himalaya in Northern India; and from the further extremity of Yemen to the shores of the Danube in Central Europe. They still form several powerful empires, amongst which we reckon Turkey and Persia; and if others, like that of the Grand Mogul, have disappeared, it is the political edifice, alone that has fallen, whereas the religious structure is still standing and solid. Through countries of such vast extent and so far removed the one from the other, under climates so various, the Mussulman faith has lost nothing of its ardour. After a lapse of twelve centuries and a half since the Hegira, it is as ardent and almost as fanatical as it was on the first day. The fire is not ready to dwindle out, as injudicious observers prognosticate; it burns still and will go on burning for a long time; the formidable outbursts which have taken place under our own eyes prove this,—the military revolt of English India in 1857, or the recent insurrection in Algeria. Christian Europe carries on with all these Mahometan populations intermittent relations of peace and of war; but, generally speaking, the latter tend to predominate. In proportion as we become better acquainted with the people, we are more inclined not to despise them, as was formerly done. They have the most real qualities of courage and of perseverance. Unshaken in the belief which their forefathers held, they are much less disposed than we are to become converts to another faith. Their morals are, it is true, much inferior to ours; but that corruption is an old disease, which, at all times, has eaten up Asia and Africa. Mahometism is not responsible for the malady; nay, it has tried to cure it. Our industry, our sciences, our arts will penetrate gradually amongst those nations which begin to know the benefits they carry in their train, and which are naturally so little rebellious to them that in some respects they have had by many centuries the start of us in the same path. But if, through their contact with us they

keep making material progress, religiously speaking we obtain no success over them; and the heroic preaching of our missionaries, so fruitful elsewhere, will always fail before Mahometism, which it cannot conquer. On their own shewing they find there the greatest obstacle in their universal apostleship."

Religions, according to M. Saint Hilaire, are permanent, because they correspond to the wants and feelings of the societies amongst which they have originated; and Mahometism is only an instance of that law. Mahomet understood admirably the country, the age, the civilization in which he lived; he did not aim at establishing a new faith; he came to reproduce and complete the monotheistic doctrines of the Jews, and to bring to light a teaching which his contemporaries had forgotten. Mosaism and Christianity had already, before the coming of Mahomet, endeavoured to destroy the idolatrous practices of the Arabs, but in vain; to the prophet of Islam belongs the glory of having accomplished that difficult task.

M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire's conclusion then is, that Mahomet, as a religious reformer, deserves the respect and the admiration of posterity. But he was, besides, the founder of an empire; and here we have to descend upon a much lower sphere. In the first place, and taking a general view of the subject, politics must to a great extent make use of force; they need never, we grant, resort to fraud, violence, deceit, and crime; but, on the other hand, they leave mere persuasion to prophets and priests. Such was the case with Mahomet; and even he did not willingly or out of selfishness become a general, the chief of an empire. It was only after he had been directly threatened, after an attempt had been made to murder him, that he felt obliged to provide for his own safety. The emigrants who followed him in his flight to Medina, the devoted population of Yathrib, urged him on, and events led him to adopt a course which was really contrary to his natural disposition. M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire shews that the Arabs, an essentially warlike people, could not understand any revolution which was not more or less associated with politics, and Mahomet had unfortunately to introduce too great a proportion of the human element into the reformer's mission.

Such are, briefly, the leading ideas of M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire's volume; it may be considered as embodying the latest intelligence respecting the history of a very powerful sect of religionists, and it deserves, from that point of view, to be attentively studied. M.

De la Démocratie chez les Prédicateurs de la Ligue. Par CHARLES LABITTE. Deuxième édition. Paris: Durant.

M. CHARLES LABITTE's curious and instructive work had been for several years out of print, and we often wondered that a new edition of it should not be brought before the public. Amongst the numerous essays or disquisitions written by our Gallican neighbours on the history of the sixteenth century, this is decidedly one of the very best, and we are glad that an opportunity now offers of analysing its contents in *The Journal of Sacred Literature*.

It is, to begin with, a singular fact that the French *Ligue* should have found apologists recently in the two extreme regions of the political world. The historians of the seventeenth century and the *philosophers* of the eighteenth had been equally strong in their denunciation of it; the former considering it as an attempt to destroy the national unity, whilst the latter condemned it as a blow struck on behalf of religious fanaticism, at the imprescriptible rights of conscience. It was reserved for our own age to whitewash the *Ligue* in the same manner as it has whitewashed so many doubtful reputations; and M. de Bonald in the name of the legitimists praised the tyranny, the excesses, the misrule which M. Buchez extolled with similar enthusiasm, because the reign of the *sixteen* seemed a kind of anticipation of the famous *comité de salut public*. M. Charles Labitte's volume is a conclusive refutation of those paradoxes; the religious element being the strongest one in the history of the *Ligue*, our author has been naturally led to study chiefly the pulpit orators of the day, and thus the subject of the work falls properly under our cognizance. Whilst the civil wars of the sixteenth century were raging, the pulpit too often served the purpose of incendiary newspapers, and the churches, especially at Paris, became transformed into clubs.

M. Labitte commences by taking a glance at popular preaching during the mediæval period. Immediately after the death of Saint Bernard, a period of decay set in, and although its first symptoms were rather of a literary character than otherwise, yet party politics soon invaded the temples of God, and the clergy, both regular and secular, who denounced from the pulpit the Armagnacs and the Bourguignons, respectively, may be compared in point of violence with the Bouchers and the Guebrards of later days. If time allowed us to digress for a while from our real subject, we might quote some of M. Labitte's remarks on the pamphlet-literature of the sixteenth century. Hotman's *Franco-Gallia*, Hubert Languet's *Vindiciæ contra tyrannos*, and other works of the same kind, helped on the liberal movement which was manifesting itself on all sides; either cramped by the spirit of pedantry, or running riot in every kind of licentiousness, the Roman Catholic pulpit had sunk to the lowest pitch of disrepute, whilst the eloquent, solemn, soul-stirring sermons of the Huguenots enlisted on the side of the Reformation all those who cared in the slightest degree for religion.

During the ten years which preceded the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, the monks did their best to fan the flame of persecution, and to excite the rabble against the unfortunate Protestants. Fournier preaching one day on a text in the Old Testament, thus said to the people, "The Latin gives us the word *castellum*; but that which we have in view is not a true castle; how shall we designate it? *Castellum* is the diminutive of *castrum*; we shall call it in French *chastelet*. *Chastelet* is not the proper term; let us say *chastillon*. It is *chastillon*, then, who is against you, and who will ruin you unless you take care." This wretched play on the words thus pointed out Admiral Coligny to the daggers of his assassins.

The *Ligue* may be said to have originated with the weakness of the king, Henry III. After the meeting of the States-General at Blois, he perceived that the Catholics were in the ascendancy, and he resolved upon declaring himself the head of a party which he could not control. He assumed the position of the first on the roll of the *Ligue*. He was really their tool; and whilst the most fanatic amongst them watched him carefully, those who had sincerely at heart the interests of virtue and religion denounced with great plainness of speech his debauchery and his hypocrisy. The Benedictine Maurice Poncet, *homo doctus*, says de Thou, *sed interdum scurrili discutiunt mordax*, preaching at Notre Dame in March 1583, called the brotherhood of penitents, founded by Henry III., *la confrérie des hypocrites et Athéistes*, and then he added: "I have been informed on good authority that last evening, which happened to be the Friday of their procession, the spit was turning for the supper of those fat penitents. . . . Ah! wretched hypocrites, you laugh then at God under your masks, and you wear at your girdle a whip of cords, in order to keep up appearances. It is not there, in God's name, that you should have it, but on your back and shoulders, to give yourselves a sound thrashing; and there is not one of you who does not richly deserve it." Poor Poncet had to pay the penalty of his frankness, and Henry III. sent "*the old fool*," as he called him, to prison. The punishment, however, was not of long duration.

The king's authority everywhere set at nought, could not prevent the rapid growth of the *Ligue*. From Paris the movement spread throughout the provinces; at Nîmes, at Lyons, at Rouen, at Orleans, popular preachers deprecated in the strongest terms any attempt whereby a compromise might be made with the Huguenots. François de Rosières, archdeacon of Toul, declaimed in the cathedral of that city against the king *con plausibile popolare eloquenza*, says Davila. At the death of the Duke d'Alençon, Henry of Navarre, a Huguenot, being heir apparent to the throne, all the Roman Catholics freely set forward the pretended claims of the Lorraine princes, and the Duke de Guise cleverly encouraged preachers to advocate his interests as the only true defender of the Catholic faith.

It must not be supposed, however, that the whole French clergy both high and low, regular and secular, was infected with the revolutionary spirit. M. Labitte has enrolled in his book a few names which deserve to be handed down to posterity. But in times of civil disturbances we know that the adepts of wickedness have always the superiority for a short season at least; and the cowardice of some joined to the impudence of others will almost uniformly defeat the energy of the handful of true patriots who would re-establish the reign of order, and vindicate the majesty of the law.

M. Labitte has given us the biography of the most influential amongst the *Ligue*-preachers; we have, in the first place, Jean Boucher, "*séditieux emporté jusqu'à la démenée*," as Voltaire calls him, eloquent and affecting an air of devotion, but eaten up by his ambition, and disconsolate at not having obtained from his patrons the bishopric

to which he firmly believed his violence entitled him. Guillaume Rose comes next, *le plus enragé ligueur qui fut en France*, says Bayle, drawing multitudes to his sermons, and preaching the most detestable doctrines with all the fervour of an apostle. Raised to the episcopal see of Senlis by the protection of the king, he took advantage of his dignity to further as much as possible the interests of the *Ligue*. *Nemo in commovendis ad seditionem animis acerbior*; such is the character which the historian de Thou gives of him—a singular one for a bishop. His admirers, taking advantage of a name especially suited to exercise the ingenuity of punsters, wrote Latin verses in his honour, calling him “the rose of kings, the rose of princes, the rose of the people, the rose of theologians, a rose which the jealousy of heretics could not soil,—a rose, the leaves of which could not be scattered about by the tempest,” etc.

It is no use going on with the long catalogue of the other pulpit orators who espoused the cause of the *Ligue*; we find them uniformly branded by historians with the epithets rogue, wretch, stirrer up of sedition; and it would be as unprofitable to dwell here upon their history, as it would be, in an account of the French Revolution, to enumerate all the disciples of Marat and Collot d'Herbois. It may be supposed that the murder of Henry III. by Jacques Clément supplied ample materials for the enthusiasm of the *Ligueurs*. The books of the Old Testament were ransacked for metaphors and comparisons which might give an adequate idea of the service rendered to the cause of ultramontaniam by the wretched Dominican friar, nor can we be astonished at the violence of the popular preachers, when we find Pope Sixtus V. assimilating the tragic death of Henry III., as far as its utility went, to the incarnation of our Lord, and as far as the murderer's heroism, to the deed of Judith.

The sermons of the Parisian clergy are the best authority we have for the history of the *Ligue*: they reproduce in the most faithful manner the intrigues, the passions, the hatred, the hopes which agitated the metropolis, and we find there the fickleness of party-spirit naïvely portrayed. In the meanwhile, Henry of Navarre was struggling in order to gain his crown, and the fortune of war had begun to decide in his favour. Then the rage of the *Ligueurs* knew no bounds, and every church in Paris resounded with denunciations so violent that they became positively ridiculous. On the fifteenth of April, 1591, Aubry announced from the pulpit that the city of Chartres had been sold to the *Béarnais* by the moderate Catholics, and he added: “My friends, if ever that wicked relaps and excommunicated wretch enters Paris, he will take away from us our holy mass, he will turn our churches into stables for his horses, kill our priests, and make of our consecrated ornaments, dresses and liveries for his pages.” To which, Dom Félibier remarks, he added by a horrible blasphemy: “What I tell you is as true as is the God whom I am about to eat and to receive.” Thanks to such odious calumnies, the Parisians persisted in not crediting the news of the conversion of Henry of Navarre to Roman-Catholicism—a conversion which was already talked of as about to take place.

After the monarch had really abjured and been reconciled to the Roman church, the *Ligueurs* pretended for a long time not to believe it. M. Labitte gives us in his book an analysis of Porthaise's *five sermons on the simulated conversion of the king of Navarre*. They are curious enough as sketches of the time, but they sink far below the compositions of the notorious Boucher, who in a course of sermons treated likewise *de la simulée conversion de Henri de Bourbon*. At last, however, the most confirmed supporters of the *Ligue* were obliged to submit, and the ranters who had during more than ten years been the rulers of consciences throughout France, had either to recant or to hide themselves. The pungent truths of the *Satire Ménippée*, its sound common sense and its patriotism opened the eyes of Frenchmen; the courage and the true-heartedness of Henry IV. did the rest. Some of the once popular preachers in the pay of Rome died of misery; a few, better advised, forsook controversy for erudition, and obtained as scholars an amount of celebrity which was calculated to make them regret the time they had wasted in stirring up sedition.

M. Labitte's excellent volume concludes with a sketch of pulpit-oratory during the reign of Henry IV., and an appendix on the *Satire Ménippée*, Guillaume Rose and Mariana. M.

Ungedruckte, Unbeachtete, und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel, herausgegeben und in Abhandlungen erläutert. Von. Dr. C. P. CASPARI. Vol. I. Christiania, 1866.

THIS is the first portion of what promises to be a valuable contribution to the literature of the creeds of the early Christian Church. Dr. Caspari, the theological professor of the University of Norway, is an eminent Orientalist, and in other ways excellently qualified for researches like those he has now entered upon. He has entered upon his work in the proper spirit, being evidently resolved to avail himself of all accessible sources of original information. He has, therefore, sought for materials not only in printed books of acknowledged authority, but has inquired after inedited documents in the British Museum and other great libraries, besides those to which he has immediate access. To shew the value and importance of the materials here collected and thoroughly investigated, it will suffice to mention the topics of the successive chapters. In the first chapter he gives and discusses at great length the version of a creed which is ascribed to Athanasius, as printed from a Vatican MS., in the Benedictine edition of Athanasius. This creed is based upon the Nicene, which it amplifies and develops, and is quite different from the wellknown so-called Athanasian creed. Dr. Caspari shews that it is closely similar to a creed which is found in the works of Epiphanius. The second chapter is occupied with portions of an Antiochian creed, as found in the acts of the Council of Ephesus, and in a homily by Chrysostom. The third and fourth articles are devoted to the examination of the Nicene creed, and its modified form, as adopted at the Council of Constantinople. In the

next place we have a confession of faith in the form adopted by the Nestorians, and varying in some respects from that of Nicea. This is followed by a confession of faith in the Incarnation of the Word of God, ascribed to Athanasius, and found in a Syriac MS. in the British Museum, as well as in Greek. At the close of the chapter the author alludes to an English version of this creed, inserted by Cowper in his *Analecta Nicæna*, in 1857, apparently not knowing that it was extant in Greek. He also observes that Cowper seems not to have known the creed of John of Jerusalem, which forms the subject of the succeeding chapter. Dr. Caspari is correct in the first of these conjectures, but not in the second, for the creed of John is on Cowper's private list made years ago. In that list, under the head of John of Jerusalem, the following MSS. are referred to: 12154, 12156, 14529, 14532, and 14533. In fact, a part of John's creed is translated in *Syriac Miscellanies*, page 59 (London, 1861.) No notice would have been taken here of Dr. Caspari's remark, but for the fact that it arises out of a misconception of the extent to which the editor of this Journal carried his researches among the manuscripts in question at a time when scarcely any one in England, with the distinguished exception of the late Dr. Cureton, paid much attention to them. The notes made then comprehend thousands of references to these precious documents. Happily, ten or twelve years have seen a change, and above all, the manuscripts are in the hands of a gentleman who loves and respects them, and who is carrying out systematically and officially a work which Cowper laboured at spasmodically, unaided, unencouraged, and under the pressure of other weighty duties. No man rejoices more than he in the altered state of things, and he is vain enough to believe that Dr. Land represented him, for the best of reasons, as a guide through an unexplored country. Here are his words:—*Proximum erat scripta quædam prælo designarem. Qua in re mirifice mihi profuit—B. H. C.—benevolentia, qui ex annotatiunculis quas nostra Musei volumina diligenter perlustrans ante paraverat, haud pauca mecum, communicavit, pari fere modo ac regionis incolæ peregrinis venatoribus vestigia monstrare solent, fallacia quidem interdum, at sæpius tamen utilissima summiq[ue] pretii.* The *fallacia interdum* may have occurred, but if Dr. L. had acknowledged separately all that he thought so *utilissima* that he availed himself of them in his *Anecdota Syriaca*, many persons would have thought the *annotatiunculæ* and personal directions received by him at least a great saving of his labour, and a proof that Cowper knew and was ready to tell others something about the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum. But leaving personal matters, let it be avowed that he who utilizes a discovery confers a more direct obligation upon society than he who makes a discovery and does no more. As a rule also the honour or reward is greater, and Dr. Caspari will have all the praise we can give him for turning to so good account what he has received from Dr. W. Wright in particular, whose generosity in imparting what he knows is manifest in his valuable and curious contributions to this Journal.

The last section in Professor Caspari's book is devoted to a remarkable Greek Nicæno-Constantinopolitan creed in the Western form, after a St. Gall M.S. of the tenth century.

In his subsequent pages our author will be able to avail himself atill further of the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, containing as they do at least ten or twelve differing confessions of faith, beginning with that of Antioch in the middle of the third century, and including those of Nestorius, Evagrius, Severus, Chalcedon, etc.

Etudes sur les Evangiles Apocryphes. Par MICHEL NICOLAS. Paris, 1866.

FOR some years past there has been shewn a growing disposition to study the apocryphal literature of the early Christians. This literature comprises gospels, apostolical acts, epistles, revelations, etc. It has been more carefully sought after, and numerous additions have been made to the older published collections. With some the study has been one of literary curiosity only; with others it has been with a desire to ascertain the relations of these documents to the New Testament. Some have laboured to shew how little claim the apocryphal books have upon our credit, and how far they are removed from the dignity, simplicity, and general worth of writings commonly received. But some have scarcely disguised their wish to find in them that which, on one account or another, may be brought into some kind of competition with the New Testament, and may depreciate the primitive Church. Whatever their motives, men have paid more attention to these books.

We mentioned the volume of Mr. Nicolas in the January number of this Journal, and we propose to add a few words to what we then said in reference to it. In his preface the author speaks of the breaking-up of old systems, and the irregular fancies which characterized the period of the foundation of the Church. Hence the religion of Christ was viewed in many aspects, its followers were almost at the outset divided into many sects, and there were almost as many gospels as sects. The many gospels were, he thinks, held in nearly equal repute at first, and the elevation of the four to their actual position was a sort of expedient to which the sect calling itself Catholic had recourse from prudential considerations. There is a good deal in this preface which we question and object to, but it is a satisfaction to see a full admission of the immense superiority of the four canonical gospels. Of many apocryphal gospels we have either only the names or mere fragments, and it is by no means fair to conclude respecting them so much as Mr. Nicolas ventures to affirm. With little more than the bare shadow of fact in his favour, and with much against him, he suggests that the canonical and the spurious gospels had something like a common origin. It would require an essay to expose the fallacies of his preliminary pages, and to point what is wholly or only partly true. But we beg the reader not to receive without personal inquiry statements which rest on so slender a foundation. At the same time there are circumstances on record

which almost excuse certain observations to which we object. Some of the grossest impositions have been received by compilers of books meant for the service of the churches. Even now the Roman Breviary under August 18, endorses the idle and absurd figments of those who concocted the tissue of fables connected with what is called the Assumption of the Virgin. Such preposterous dishonesty is a standing disgrace to those who perpetuate it. Happily the books which in the middle ages adopted some of the fictions of the false gospels are not now of any authority, and only casual incidents from such writings find favour in any Church, so far as we can ascertain.

The origin of the false gospels is a curious problem, and the solution of it must be sought in a variety of circumstances. As to their classification, M. Nicolas ranges them under three heads: first, those which emanated from the Judaizers; secondly, those of the anti-Judaizers, as the Gnostic sects; and, thirdly, such as are orthodox and not sectarian. The first and second have perished for the most part, but several of the third class remain. Whatever value may attach to this arrangement, we demur to the opinion that pure and perfect orthodoxy characterizes all we now possess. However, in accordance with his division, M. Nicolas treats of the apocryphal gospels at great length and in an interesting manner. He has accumulated and criticized a multitude of facts, and the perusal of his work will be useful to those who can read it with discretion. We regret that our space will not allow more than this general glance at a volume of substantial value.

The Treasury of Bible Knowledge: being a Dictionary of the Books, Persons, Places, Events, etc., of which mention is made in Holy Scripture. By Rev. JOHN AYRE, M.A. London: Longmans and Co.

HERE are 950 pages of small type, closely printed, and containing an accumulated mass of information on Bible subjects which is truly wonderful. In a thoroughly orthodox spirit, and with a diligence beyond our praise, Mr. Ayre has compiled a book which is honourable to him, and will be sure of large acceptance with others. He has carefully eschewed the rudeness and rashness of bilious criticism, and adopted a style and spirit which cannot be too strongly commended. His large acquaintance with all questions of Biblical literature and interpretation has enabled him to consult and wisely use the best and safest authorities. It is not every man who has the knowledge that has also the faculty of adapting it to the requirements of the multitude; but Mr. Ayre has generally succeeded in this, without descending from the dignity of his position. The work may therefore be commended to ordinary readers of the Bible, as not only intended, but fitted "to establish its authority and illustrate its contents." We are sure the liberality of the publishers in producing so sound and well got-up a work, at so low a price, will have its reward. The type is small but very clear, and the maps and illustrations are numerous and of a superior class. Among the popular Bible Dictionaries which have multiplied among us of late, the one before us will perhaps be as acceptable as any.

The Hebrew Prophets: translated afresh from the Original, with regard to the Anglican version, and with illustrations for English readers.

By ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D.D. London: Williams and Norgate.

THE prophecies included in this volume are those of Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah (i.—xxxiv.), and Nahum. Each of the books is preceded by an introduction, and the translations are accompanied by critical and explanatory notes. A slight inspection of the work shews that it is one which can be fairly dealt with only by an amount of careful criticism such as we have not yet had time to submit it to, but which we hope before long to execute. Pending such a notice, we will only indicate a very few of the impressions which we have received. First, as it regards the translation. While we readily admit that it often exhibits, better than the common one, the sense of the Hebrew, we do not think it is always free from serious objections. The style is not seldom very deficient in smoothness and clearness, and rarely suggests that any attempt has been made to exhibit the sense in an effective manner. That the translator has laboured to give the meaning is unquestionable, but his inattention to the structure of his sentences is a fault which would of itself interfere with the acceptableness of his work. Next as to the notes. These correspond, in some respects, with the text they accompany. Those of them which savour of the author's peculiar theological and religious views are not always the best. The renderings of the ancient versions are frequently quoted, alternative translations are pointed out, divers allusions are illustrated, and sometimes original observations are made. If the radical criticism of the author is very apparent in the translation and notes, it probably finds its freest expression in the introductions, where, mixed up with many things which we have no difficulty in endorsing, we encounter much that comes into collision with principles which we believe impregnable. This is all we can now say, and from what we have said, it will appear that in our opinion the work is one which lies open to many serious objections, and yet that it is one which an intelligent student, who has some knowledge of Hebrew, may frequently use with real advantage.

St. Paul: his Life and Ministry, to the end of his Third Missionary Journey. By T. BINNEY. Second Edition. London: J. Nisbet and Co.

THE talented and eloquent author of this volume is known as one of the most popular Nonconformist ministers of his day, and known too as one of the most large-hearted and catholic-souled of men. While, therefore, we have occasional expressions of personal opinion on disputed topics, we find everything couched in the gentlest of terms. The volume is redolent with the right Christian spirit, the language is transparent and often elegant, and the thoughts are frequently both profound and beautiful. Moreover, it contains a great amount of desirable information. We can conscientiously and earnestly recommend it to readers of all classes.

Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature. Third Edition. Edited by W. L. ALEXANDER, D.D. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black.

THIS noble work is now complete. The majority of the articles have been re-written, and many memoirs of Jewish and Christian writers have been added. Our admiration of the book would have been more decided if the editor had refused admission to sundry expressions of what we must call unwarrantable criticism in some of the articles. There are cases in which one writer flatly contradicts what is advanced by others. Which are we to believe? Of what earthly use is it to insert articles in defence of the Gospels (for example), and yet to admit such assertions as the following? Referring to the date of the Syriac version the writer says:—"The beginning of the third is most likely, A.D. 200. The comparatively late origin of the fourth Gospel necessitates this conclusion." He cannot possibly believe that John the Apostle wrote the fourth Gospel. The same pen in the same article writes: "It is all but certain that the proper original document of the Apostle Matthew comprehended little more than the discourses of Jesus." The natural conclusion is that St. Matthew did not write the first Gospel as we have it. Now compare herewith the articles on John and Matthew. We are unaware of the apology which will be made for these things; but if the work is merely a collection of the opinions of critics of all shades, with no pretence to harmony and agreement, let the fact be boldly declared to the world, and men will know beforehand what they are about to purchase. It is painful to point out such blemishes in a work containing so much that is admirable, and which is substantially based upon a uniform principle of liberal orthodoxy.

Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien nach den Urkunden, laut den neuern Entdeckungen und Verhandlungen. Von Dr. G. VOLKMAR. Zürich: Herzog.

A good deal of this essay is occupied with animadversions upon the recent brochure of Dr. Tischendorf upon the date of the four Gospels. The pages bristle with references to ancient and modern writers, and it is very apparent that the author has done his utmost to undermine the common opinions regarding the origin of the four Gospels. We are not sure that he is successful.

Beiträge und Documente zur Geschichte des Karäerthums und der Karäischen Literatur. Von A. NEUBAUER. Leipsic: Leiner.

THIS is a singularly curious book, the contents of which are from reliable sources. In addition to the German text, embodying a mass of matter of unusual interest, there are many extracts from ancient Hebrew documents. The work is of equal utility to the student of Hebrew sacred literature, and to any one who is investigating the history of that remarkable Jewish sect, the Karaite, to which the volume is devoted.

The Eastern Liturgy of the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Orthodox Church, simplified and supplemented; containing forms deemed valid and orthodox by all Churches, etc. By the Rev. JULES FERRETTE, of Damascus. Oxford and London: Parker and Co.

The Damascus Ritual: a complete Liturgy, extracted from the Greek Euchologium, and supplemented from the English Prayer Book. By the Rev. JULES FERRETTE. Oxford and London: Parker and Co.

THE titles of these neat little manuals pretty clearly shew their intention. The author has compiled them chiefly with the aid of the Greek Euchology, and has endeavoured to embody and retain in them only those things which are generally accepted. Many of the forms are simple and beautiful, and the whole deserve the attention of all such as are interested in liturgical subjects. These English editions are translated from the author's Greek copies. The author has also published them in Arabic, in which language he says they have been very acceptable to many Christians in the regions where his lot is cast.

The Sabbath and the Decalogue. A Reply to the Speech of the Rev. Dr. NORMAN MACLEOD. By HENRY STEVENS, M.A. Second Edition. London: Seeley, Jackson, and Halliday.

THE tone of this essay is singularly moderate; and the author is everywhere so calm and yet so confident, so frank and yet so logical, that it is quite clear he knows his case to be a good one. In so narrow limits it was not possible to marshal all the forces which might be brought to the defence of the fourth commandment; most of them have, however, been mentioned, their positions indicated, and the kind of service they might render illustrated by appropriate arguments. Few serious Christians can help regretting when able and honoured ministers of the Gospel, in an age so prone to laxity, declare themselves anxious to weaken the obligations of a law which is so seldom interpreted too rigidly in actual practice or even in theory, and which has been looked upon as one of the most merciful dispensations to a world of toil and sin. We hope Mr. Stevens will be encouraged by a very wide circulation of this pamphlet.

Apocalypses Apocryphæ Mosis, Esdræ, Pauli, Johannis, item Mariæ Dormitio; additis Evangeliorum et Actuum Apocryphorum supplementis. Maximam Partem nunc primum edidit CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF. Lipsiæ. 1866.

WE gladly welcome this additional portion of Dr. Tischendorf's valuable collection of ancient Christian Apocrypha. The series thus far consists of four parts, of which the first is preliminary, on the origin and use of the Apocryphal Gospels. The second contains Apocryphal Gospels; the third, Apocryphal Acts; and the fourth, the matters mentioned in the title. We had hoped to be able to give an account of this new service rendered by its laborious editor, but must reluctantly postpone it to another occasion. Meanwhile we cordially commend it to the attention of our readers.

The Tripartite Nature of Man : Spirit, Soul, and Body. Applied to illustrate and explain the Doctrines of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body. By the Rev. J. B. HEARD, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Bilton, Harrogate. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

A MOST able work, in which the distinction between the spirit and the soul is well worked out, and shewn to be pregnant with the greatest uses in the treatment of Christian doctrines. The author is an evangelical in the truest sense of the word, and shews a deep acquaintance with philosophical researches. The great German divines have been mastered by him successfully. We can only briefly notice the work in this number, but we are promised a review of it by the author of the papers which have appeared in our Journal on the kindred topics "*The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment and Immortality*," and "*Scripture Revelations on the Intermediate State*." W.

Handbook of Specimens of English Literature ; selected from the chief British Authors, and arranged chronologically. London: Religious Tract Society.

SOME time since we had the pleasure of noticing a *Handbook of English Literature*, and we now beg to call attention to the natural sequel to that work by the same laborious compiler. In addition to a mass of passages printed at length, references are made to numerous others of which only the commencement is given; this applies especially to Shakespeare, Milton, and Pope, whose works are of easy access. The literary merit of this volume is apparent in the plan of it and in the selections which are made; but it has another merit of no small importance, seeing that the extracts are chosen in view of the sentiments they embody, as well as of their language and style. This last feature is the more noteworthy, that it enables the compiler to introduce authors of great ability who are but too little known to general readers. For purposes of tuition in families, schools, and colleges, where Christian principles are instilled, this handbook will be a most valuable acquisition.

The Fatherhood of God in its general and special aspects, and particularly in relation to the Atonement ; with a review of recent speculations on the subject. By T. J. CRAWFORD, D.D. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood and Sons.

THE plan of this work is comprehensive and yet definite. It embodies much original thought, and the author's habits of searching inquiry and careful arrangement stand him in good stead. Whatever difference of opinion there may be on sundry topics, it would be idle to question the great ability shewn by the learned professor. As the subjects treated of have been and are so much discussed, it will be satisfactory to many to receive a book which expounds so fully, and maintains so forcibly, and on a Scriptural basis, the views of one so well qualified to speak.

The Church and the World: Essays on Questions of the Day. By various Writers. Edited by the Rev. ORRY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans and Co.

It is with regret that we feel precluded from the task of a detailed review of this book. For although ritual and ecclesiastical questions are not the only ones discussed in it, the greater portion brings us into contact with them. With such topics we profess not to interfere. Nevertheless, there are three or four of the essays in which we are directly interested, and to them we are happy to call attention. Essay No. 10 is on "Positivism," by the Rev. J. G. Smith, M.A. Though too limited for space, the author presents us with a tolerably correct account of the nature, grounds, and tendencies of positivism, and he shews the erroneous elements which it embodies. We have read this essay with pleasure for the most part, but we do wish that instead of confining himself to the Catholic Church as the true refuge of the soul, he had given more prominence to that written Word by which alone the Church is governed, and can justify its existence. The next essay upon "Revelation and Science: two interpreters of the will of God," is anonymous, but it supplies at the outset what we missed in the essay preceding it—a reference to the Scriptures as one of the two great fountains of truth and duty. Yet here again we find among much that all Christians will joyfully admit, the Church set forth as "claiming and exercising authoritatively her sovereignty on matters of faith, settling by dogmatic interpretations the definitions of Divine truth." This is surely not applicable to all religious doctrines and truths, for no Church nor age of the Church ever made so comprehensive a claim, at least not in a tangible form, so far as we know. The remark quoted must apply to the rulers of the Church, and not to individual members, by whom no dogmatic interpretation is possible, except in the exercise of private judgment. Such a principle seems calculated to diminish the direct benefit which private Christians expect, through the grace of God's Spirit, from their personal readings of Holy Scripture. While we speak thus, we gladly accept the main teachings of an essay of no mean excellence. We only add an opinion that nothing whatever is gained by regularly saying "Churchman" when the term "Christian" would be more natural and less affected. Are Churchmen not Christians?

There is one other essay, that on "Science and Prayer," by the Rev. MacColl, which contains many admirable points, and earnestly vindicates prayer from the reproach which has been thrown upon it. But with an almost amusing unconsciousness of the deep faith and living dependence in regard to prayer which characterises Christian communities, whose rigid simplicity would appal our essayist, he says, "The plain truth is, that the denial of the efficacy of prayer is a logical consequence of the rejection of the sacramental system of the Church." Surely it is not safe to say this, when we see that it is not a practical consequence, as prayer meetings and revival meetings in Europe and America for a century past, at least, make quite plain.

One cannot but feel sorry that an essay so intelligently written for the most part should be disfigured by statements so open to question. On that portion of the composition which treats of the ministry of angels, we express no opinion.

The remaining essays we must pass over. Of the book in general, we may say that it is very creditable to the learning and talent, the piety and energy of the section of the Church which it represents. And we may also say, that although not an official and authorized exposition of High Church, it is perhaps no error to regard it as a sort of manifesto, and it is certainly correct to say of it that it is full of information on topics with which few can now afford to be unacquainted.

Essays on the Irish Church. By CLERGYMEN OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH IN IRELAND. Oxford and London: James Parker and Co.

THIS is a very seasonable and interesting book, but seeing that it deals chiefly with matters somewhat out of our sphere, we can only mention the titles of the essays and their authors, who appear to have performed their parts in a very praiseworthy manner. "On the general principles of the establishment and endowment of religious bodies by the State; with special reference to Ireland:" by Rev. James Byrne, M.A. "Historical Sketch of the Church of Ireland:" by Rev. A. W. Edwards, M.A. "The Difficulties of the Irish Church:" by Rev. W. Anderson, M.A. "Some Account of the Property and Statistics of the Irish Church:" by Rev. A. T. Lee, M.A., LL.D. "The Influences exerted on Ireland by the Irish Church Establishment:" by Rev. J. Byrne, M.A. Most of our readers will be glad to read the second essay—the "Historical Sketch of the Church of Ireland," which embodies a large amount of valuable and instructive matter.

Prosperi Aquitani Chronici Continuator Harniensis. Nunc primum edidit GEORG. HILLE. Berolini: Weidmann.

THE author of this little chronicle put down a number of dates of events in the latter half of the fifth century, and on to the thirtieth year of the reign of Heraclius, or A.D. 641. Chronological students ought to possess it.

S. Ephræmi Syri Carmina Nisibena; additis prolegomenis et supplemento lexicorum Syriacorum. Primus edidit, vertit, explicavit Dr. GUSTAVUS BICKELL. Lipsiæ: F. A. Brockhaus.

ON the present occasion we can but announce the appearance of this work and its chief contents:—Prolegomena, pp. 1-36; glossary of unusual words, etc., pp. 37-70; Latin prose translation and index, pp. 71-234. The Syriac texts occupy 146 pages, and there are two pages of *corrigenda et addenda*. It is very apparent that we cannot depend upon a cursory inspection for a correct and reliable estimate of this work. We can only say the subject is one of much interest and importance in more respects than one.

Rivington's Ecclesiastical Year-book for 1865. London: Rivingtons.

THIS book is in fact a summary, yet most comprehensive, history of the Church of England in 1865. It is, therefore, a volume which will be most valuable for reference in time to come. The plan is good and well wrought out. All that is necessary to secure for it an extensive sale is to make it known as a very compact, convenient, and accurate manual. As such it affords us pleasure to recommend it.

Ritualism and the Gospel: Thoughts upon St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. With an Appendix. By Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT. London: Nisbet and Co.

THE "Thoughts" which Mr. Wright has favoured us with were addressed as sermons to his flock at Dresden, and are in fact a short practical commentary upon the chief portions of the Epistle to the Galatians. They are substantially evangelical in doctrine, and as such adhere very closely to the Scripture model. We have much pleasure in noticing so clear and faithful an exhibition of principle and duty, and warmly recommend it.

Novum Testamentum Polyglotum. Edited by C. G. W. THEILE, D.D., and R. STIER, D.D. London: Williams and Norgate.

WE beg to call attention to this most useful and well edited volume, which is both cheap and convenient as well as accurate. It contains the Greek text, the Latin Vulgate, the German of Luther, and our Authorized Version. All four texts are exhibited at every opening of the volume, which, moreover, displays important various readings, and references to parallel passages.

L'Idée de Dieu, et ses Nouveaux Critiques. Par E. CARO. Paris: Hachette.

THE learned and talented author of this work may congratulate himself on the success which he has achieved, and the rapid sale of his publication. The book is one which may be confidently recommended as one of great and varied interest on topics of paramount importance. We beg to call to it the attention of those who have not yet seen it, and to record our appreciation of its distinguished merits.

The Sacrificial Vestments: are they legal in the Church of England? An Inquiry into the history and intention of the Second Rubric of the Book of Common Prayer. By WILLIAM MILTON, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

A CAREFUL and comprehensive examination of authorities in regard to a question which it is curious should have been unasked till now. The question is one which we are prevented from discussing; but we fear that if everything is lawful in the Church so long as not in formal terms prohibited, peace and union will not be seen in our days.

Bounties with Rome, as advocated in the "Eirenicon" of Dr. Pusey.
Two Sermons by S. BUTCHER, D.D. Dublin: Hodges, Smith,
and Co.

THESE sermons are an able embodiment of facts and arguments bearing upon the *Eirenicon*; and are followed by a useful and carefully compiled appendix of notes. Dr. Butcher demonstrates, we think, that the English Church could not be united to Rome on any terms which would not exclude immense numbers of persons, or compel them to sacrifice not a few of their most solemn and conscientious convictions.

De la Date de nos Evangiles; ou réponse populaire à cette question: Quand est ce que nos Evangiles ont été composés? Par CONSTANTIN TISCHENDORF. Toulouse: Société des Livres Religieux.

WE are glad to see a French version of an essay which will instruct and please many who have no time or no taste for more elaborate and scholastic productions.

The Life and the Light. A Sermon by Rev. HENRY ALLON. London: Jackson, Walford, and Co.

MR. ALLON is the able minister of Union Chapel, Islington, and he preached this discourse on behalf of the Wesleyan Missionary Society. The sermon is liberal, but practical and evangelical in its tone, and it is worthy of high praise as an eloquent exposition of great principles and duties.

Christianity and Recent Speculations. Six lectures by Ministers of the Free Church. With Preface by R. S. CANDLISH, D.D. Edinburgh: J. Maclaren.

WE live in the new apologetic age, and hence the constant issue of works in defence of Christian principles. The subjects of these lectures are: The Bible not inconsistent with science; The place and ends of Miracles; Spiritual Christianity in relation to secular progress; The purpose and form of Holy Scripture; Prayer and Natural Law; and The Sabbath. We have much pleasure in expressing the opinion that this is a most seasonable book, well executed, and fitted for extensive service in the cause of God and truth.

Christianity without Judaism. A second series of Essays. By Rev. BADEN POWELL, M.A. Second edition, revised. London: Longmans and Co.

WE willingly bear testimony to the great ability manifested in this book, the peculiar and original views of which are expressed with much force and freedom, and, as is well known, have won for it a position of some celebrity. Although we often differ from the author's opinions, we are glad that this new edition has appeared, because it will enable many to examine them who have had no opportunity of seeing the previous edition.

Forty-nine Opinions of Eminent Men on the Authority and Observance of the Sabbath. London: 20 John Street, Adelphi.

A VERY useful and interesting tract on the Lord's-day question. The extracts are ranged alphabetically, and are well fitted to shew the opinions which many great men have expressed regarding the duties and advantages of the Christian Sabbath.

Les Apôtres. Par ERNEST RENAN. Paris: Levy, frères.

THIS second volume has no chance of causing a sensation like that which followed the appearance of the *Life of Jesus*. The former book flashed like a meteor upon the eyes of the world, or came like the booming of the gun which gives the signal for a war in which we must take a part *pro aris et focis*. But now we have had some experience in the war, the opening of a second campaign, as some will think it, rouses no great curiosity, anxiety, or enthusiasm on either side. It is unnecessary for us to describe M. Renan's literary and critical procedures, and we have not space at present to analyze and estimate the book. There are many things in it which are true and beautiful, few which have the air of novelty thrown over the *Life of Jesus*, and some which we think quite fanciful. Although we differ so much and so often from the author, we cannot but recognize in him a singular absence of that bitterness and spirit of vituperation and contempt which is common in our day. True, the book is avowedly a history, but it is an armed history, and one which comes to dispute the ground occupied by many preceding histories of the same times and events. We advise our readers to peruse the book, and we hope to have an early opportunity of reviewing it at some length.

Achtzehn Hebräische Grabinschriften aus der Krun. Ein Beitrag zur Biblischen Chronologie, Semitischen Paliographie, und alten Ethnographie. Von D. CHWOLSON. St. Petersburg: Eggers and Co.

THE existence of ancient books and monuments among the Caraites of the Crimea has been long known and frequently noticed, but it is not till recently that any considerable researches have been made in regard to them. Inquiries made in 1839 brought to light fifty-one ancient Biblical MSS. and fifty-nine copies of ancient sepulchral inscriptions. Of the MSS., one dates from A.D. 640. Further explorations were rewarded by additional inscriptions. These discoveries stimulated inquiry, and led to new revelations of a very curious and important kind. Not content with copies from the monuments, eight of the original inscriptions were procured in 1863, and deposited in the Asiatic Museum at St. Petersburg. Dr. Chwolson published facsimiles of these eight and of ten others, along with a mass of valuable information collected from divers sources, both in regard to the inscriptions and to Biblical MSS. as well as in regard to the history of the Crimean Jews. The dates assigned to the eighteen monumental stones are these: A.D. 6; 30, 89, 179, 197, 262, 305, 369, 625, 670, 678, 719, 807, 884, 898, 937,

958, and 960. Besides these there are copies of six others from the Caucasus, of which the dates are A.D. 597, 598, 604, and 609,—three bearing the last date. As examples of the inscriptions we give translations of the three oldest.

This is the monument of Buki the son of Isaac the priest. His rest be in Paradise at the time of the salvation of Israel! In the year 702 years of our exile (*i.e.*, A.D. 6).

Rabbi Moses Levi (or, the Levite) died in the year 726 of our exile (*i.e.*, A.D. 30).

Zadok the Levite, son of Moses, died 4000 after the creation, 785 of our exile (*i.e.*, A.D. 89).

The rest of the inscriptions are very interesting, and frequently embody pious wishes for the deceased.

It is impossible in a short notice to do justice to the great learning and research displayed by Professor Chwolson in this remarkable book. We have no doubt whatever that it will be prized as it deserves to be by every scholar who is interested in Jewish archæology and bibliography. It seems to bring us, beyond dispute, into the presence of descendants of those tribes which were exiled nearly seven hundred years before Christ.

A History of the Gipsies: with specimens of the Gipsy Language, by W. SIMSON. Edited, with preface, introduction, and notes, and a disquisition on the past, present, and future of Gipsydom. By JAMES SIMSON. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston.

A VERY remarkable book, containing a wonderful amount of curious matter and equally curious speculations. Mr. James Simson advances many remarkable and untenable, but at the same time amusing ideas. He thinks, for example, that the gipsies are descended from "the mixed multitude" which came out of Egypt at the Exodus; and he says, "That the 'mixed multitude' travelled into India, acquired the language of that part of Asia, and perhaps modified its appearance there, and became the origin of the gipsy race, we may very safely assume." With equal safety we may assume that this, and very much more to be found in the same book, is quite erroneous, but it is after all a decidedly entertaining volume.

The Resurrection of the Just, and their condition in a Future State; considered chiefly with a view to the doctrine of Mutual Recognition. Eight Sermons. By Rev. J. T. PLUMMER, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

HERE are eight sermons upon a subject which will always be one of extreme personal interest to the mass of Christians. The author writes in a devout and scriptural manner, and his sermons will be read with pleasure by those who are like-minded with himself. He has read some of the works most in favour with the orthodox schools, and earnestly maintains the doctrine of the mutual recognition of the risen

in the world to come. Certain notes and extracts are appended to the sermons, but what does Mr. Plummer mean in the first of these notes when he speaks of Justin Martyr "as being the earliest father of the Christian Church?" There is a good deal of edifying reading in the volume.

Swiss Pictures; drawn with pen and pencil. The illustrations by E. WHYMPER, F.R.G.S. London: Religious Tract Society.

THIS volume is most beautifully illustrated, and the typography is excellent. It abounds in useful information, and no traveller to Switzerland should go without it. Those who stay at home will find it a charming volume for the family library. Venice and other places described in it have at present exceptional interest, and the notices of them are pleasingly and accurately written.

Letters from Florence on the Religious Reform Movements in Italy. By W. TALMADGE, B.A. London: Rivingtons.

MOST of these letters appeared in the *Guardian*, and attracted much attention. They will be very welcome in their present form as a graphic description and record of matters which will have an interest in the future. The author writes clearly and with much candour and fairness, and we have pleasure in recommending his book to all who wish to know more of its subject.

The Annotated Book of Common Prayer; being a Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. Edited by the Rev. J. H. BLOUNT, M.A. Part I. London: Rivingtons.

ALTHOUGH this elaborate book lies somewhat beyond our domain, we are happy to say a few words indicative of its plan and editorship. The editor has had the co-operation of several accomplished clergymen, whose contributions are very properly acknowledged. Particular mention is made of the Reverends T. W. Perry, W. D. Macray, J. B. Dykes, J. I. Fowler, W. Bright, P. G. Medd, and M. E. C. Walcott. Some of these gentlemen have furnished contributions of considerable interest and importance. The volume supplies a great mass of information which will just now be specially valuable, and the list of authorities consulted includes many, we cannot say all, that we naturally look for, besides some which are new to us. Of course the literature of the Prayer-book is enormous, but there are books like that of *Harrison on the Rubrics* (Rivingtons, 1845), and numerous older ones, which we should have expected to see on the list. The work itself must be regarded as a very elaborate attempt to produce a cyclopædic commentary upon the Common Prayer-book. Besides the copious, we had almost said voluminous, introductory essays and notes, the text of the forms is illustrated by parallels in Latin, and an abundance of annotations. The rubrics are by no means overlooked, and even the

black-letter days of the calendar are represented by a variety of observations, historical and other. These same black-letter days are called "minor holydays;" but is it true of a great many of them that they are "holydays" at all in the view of the Church of England? If they are, the consequences may become serious: if they are not, why has Mr. Blount admitted so many ridiculous and unhistorical details about some of them? We have nothing to say about any other feature of the book at present, but we seriously object to grave relations of mediæval fables as if they were true, when they are not true.

The Bible Dictionary. Illustrated with nearly 600 engravings. In Two Volumes. London: Cassell, Patter, and Galpin.

We have here nearly twelve hundred pages of large octavo letter-press double columns, closely printed it is true, but in a very legible character. On several accounts we have felt much interested in the progress and completion of this work. It was one of the latest projects in which the late John Cassell interested himself with a view to the popularization of religious, theological, and critical knowledge. It was at the same time the first scheme for a popular Bible dictionary which should rest on an Evangelical basis, and at the same time be an independent work embodying the results of recent scholarship. None of the Bible dictionaries published when this was planned and started took the same ground. It was therefore intended to fill a gap in our literature. Many writers of known ability were invited to co-operate upon it, and a good number actually took part in it. Although not sectarian, the writers were mostly members of the Church of England; the remainder were attached to various orthodox communities. The articles on ecclesiastical questions were all written by Churchmen; but those on other subjects were allotted without respect to denominational peculiarities. It was published in monthly parts with undeviating regularity during a course of three years. In the first instance the direction was placed in a single pair of hands, but it was found necessary to increase the number to three, or rather to four, and so it continued to the end. Owing to the plan adopted a general harmony pervades the work, and only casual and minute discrepancies appear. The cost and labour of producing the volumes was far from inconsiderable, but, as we said, it was brought out with uninterrupted regularity, and the later portions shew no falling off in the matter. The plan and aim necessitated the exclusion of much technical matter of no great popular interest, but it enabled the editors to introduce many things likely to be generally useful, and not previously found in cheap Bible dictionaries. The matter is not a compilation from older dictionaries, but is derived from the best authorities, as is apparent to all who examine the references and the style of the articles. The vast number of details rendered much condensation imperative, and hence there are very few examples of prolix dissertations. All the proper names in the canonical books, and all the principal words are dealt with separately, and many subjects are handled collectively as

well, *e.g.*, doctrines and sciences. Besides, there are notices of the principal ancient versions and manuscripts. The work has therefore a comprehensiveness unknown in earlier manuals. The words upon which the articles are based are accented, and the etymology of the proper names is given. Many of the maps and illustrations are exceedingly well fitted for their purpose, while they adorn the book. The abridgments of Kitto's *Dictionary* and of Dr. Smith's scarcely appeal to the same class of readers. Dr. Fairbairn's is unfinished, and on a totally different plan. The new edition of Kitto and the dictionary of Dr. Smith are only or mainly meant for the learned, and are far more costly. Dr. Eadie's is behind the age, and Mr. Ayre's *Bible Treasury*, just published, is alone likely to appeal to a similar constituency. This being obtainable in monthly sixpenny parts, and forming two portly volumes in large type and well printed, is, we believe, destined to be very popular. We know that the mass of the information given is scholarlike and trustworthy, and that the work contains a mine of real wealth for all who wish to understand the Scriptures more perfectly. To ministers, teachers, and families it will be of inestimable value.

A Description of the Great Bible, 1539, and the six editions of Cranmer's Bible, 1540, 1541, printed by Grafton and Whitchurch; also of the Editions, in large folio, of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures, printed in the years 1611, 1613, 1617, 1634, 1640. By FRANCIS FRY, F.S.A. Illustrated with titles, and with passages from the editions, the genealogies, and the maps, copied in facsimile; also with an identification of every leaf of the first seven, and of many leaves of the other editions, on fifty-one plates, together with an original leaf of each of the editions described. London: Willis and Sotheran. Bristol: Lasbury.

WE have copied the whole of the title of Mr. Fry's new book, which is as admirable in its execution as it is original in its conception. The author is too well known for his untiring zeal and his minute accuracy to require either introduction or commendation. No man has won for himself greater praise by his exertions in a department of bibliography which is second to none in interest and real importance. The volume has been in our hands long enough for us to examine it with care and attention, and we have unmixed pleasure in speaking well of it. As a book, it is got up in a very superior style, so that it is one which every lover of such things will covet. But it is of the editorial department of which we must especially, though briefly speak. The fact is, that from its very nature, an ordinary reviewer can do little more than describe it. It commences with an accurate description of the Great Bible, and of the six editions of Cranmer's version. The details are drawn up in a precise and succinct form, so that any one will be able to identify the books if they come under his notice, even though they should be, as they usually are, defective in one particular or another. The next section contains a similar description of the large folio editions of the Authorized Version, mentioned in the title-

page. The accounts given bring out many curious results which throw considerable light upon the history of the editions in question, and will therefore be very welcome to the bibliographer. After the formal descriptions of the various volumes, we have a selection of the different renderings of the Great Bible by Lord Thomas Cromwell, 1539, and the first edition by Archbishop Cranmer, 1540. This specimen of a collation will shew the anxiety of those who produced the second of the two, to present a more accurate and expressive rendering of the sacred text. Other notes follow the collation. The remainder of the work consists of the facsimiles and tables, and the original leaves. The facsimiles are lithographed in a style which all must pronounce excellent, so wonderfully exact and minute are they in their details. The very paper upon which they appear is ancient, at least in appearance, and the distinctions of the portions printed in red and black respectively are preserved. As for the original leaves, they are taken from the Book of Joshua for the first six, and, as far as possible, contain the same chapters of the text. By their means any one with an imperfect copy of either can identify it, if it contains the part selected, as it is very likely to do. For the Authorized Version we have leaves of the black-letter folios of the first and second editions of 1611, and of the reprint of the second edition. These leaves are from the Book of Ezra, as also are those from the black-letter folios of 1617, 1634, and 1640; that from the edition of 1613 is out of Jeremiah, but its typography differs in a marked manner from that of the others, and would be recognized at once. The differences between the three last specimens are most apparent in the ornamental capitals at the head of the chapters, otherwise the pages begin and end with the same words.

The rarity of most of the volumes described, and the estimation in which they are held, apart from other considerations, quite justifies the labour expended upon them by Mr. Fry. We are glad to learn that he contemplates further efforts in the same direction, and we sincerely hope that wealthy lovers of our noble old English Bible will patronize his undertakings sufficiently to reimburse him at any rate for the great outlay of money, without which it is impossible to produce such works as the one before us. Few gentlemen have the ability, and fewer still have the will and the means to perform such services for us. In conclusion, we can only thank the accomplished and zealous editor for a book which would do credit to the literature of any country, but which ought to be especially valued and esteemed in our own.

We have also received the following :—

The Church of Ireland; her History and Claims. Four Sermons. By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D. Second Edition. London: Rivingtons.

Aleph v. Colenso. By Rev. H. F. Woolrych, M.A. Maidstone: Welscomb and Smith.

Inconsistency: Real and Apparent. A Sermon. By J. G. Cazenove, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

A Charge to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Archdeaconry of Sudbury.
By Lord A. Hervey, M.A. London: Methuillan and Co.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. Vol. II. Part I.

The Christian Advocate and Review. Vol. V.

Aunt Judy's Magazine. Parts I. and II.

The Imperial Bible Dictionary. Edited by Rev. P. Fairbairn, D.D. Parts XXII. and XXIII.

The American Bibliotheca Sacra. April.

Dictionnaire étymologique des Mots de la Langue Française dérivés de l'Arabe, du Persan ou du Turc, avec leurs analogues Grecs, Latins, Espagnols, Portugais et Italiens. Par A. P. Pihan. Paris: 1866.

Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud. Biblisch-Talmudisches Wörterbuch. Von Dr. J. Hamburger. Heft I. Strelitz: 1866.

Ueber die Jüdische Angelologie und Dämonologie in ihrer Abhängigkeit vom Parsismus. Von Dr. Alex. Kohut. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.

Works of T. Goodwin, D.D. Vol. XII. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

Commentary on Ephesians. By P. Bayne. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

Works of Thomas Brooks. Edited by A. B. Grosart. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht von Dr. J. O. K. von Hofmann. Part II. 2 Corinthians.

Histoire de la Réformation en Europe au temps de Calvin. J. H. Merle d'Aubigné. Tom. IV. England, Geneva, France, Germany, and Italy.

Etudes Paléographiques et Historiques sur des Papyrus du vi^e Siècle, en partie inédits, renfermans des Homélies de Saint Avit, et de Saint Augustin. Genève and Bale: H. Georg.

Sermons par Eugene Bersier. Vol. II. Paris: Meyruéis.

Dieu et la Création. Par J. B. Lacour. Paris: Meyruéis.

La Revelation de Saint Jean expliquée par les Ecritures, et expliquant l'Histoire précédée d'une brève interprétation des prophéties de Daniel. Par F. de Rougemont. Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Sandoz.

Geschichten des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts seit den Wiener Verträgen. Von G. G. Gervinus. Vol. VIII. Leipzig: Engelmann.

Augustin und Goethe's Faust. Vortrag, von Dr. P. Kleinert. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben.

A Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan manuscripts in the Imperial Library at Paris has just been issued. It forms a quarto volume of 268 pages, printed in double columns.

The Roman Index.—The Congregation of the Index at Rome, has recently condemned several works, among which are *Les Apôtres*, by M. Renan; *Le Catholicisme Romain en Russie*, by M. Tolstoy; *La Bible et l'Humanité*, by Michelet; and *L'Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise*, by Taine. One could wish that this farce were abolished, because it only excites curiosity in regard to the books condemned. On the other hand, Rome keeps up her claim to supreme dominion in the literary world, and it is well to be reminded of what she would do if she had the power.

MISCELLANIES.

Bible Revision.—The *Contemporary Review* for June contains among other matters an article upon the "Revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament." To much that is in the article we readily assent; and we are glad to see the great question it bears upon brought before the public in so extensively read a journal. There seems to be no doubt whatever of the real influence which has for two centuries checked all avowed attempts to revise the English Bible. Greek and Hebrew scholars of the greatest eminence have generally been in favour of a change, and for a century or so, intelligent English readers have also pleaded for the removal of obsolete, rude, obscure, and indecent words and phrases. Thus a double power has been exerted by grave, learned, and godly men in favour of improvement. To these it has been objected that the translation, as a whole, is excellent, that it has been wonderfully useful in the world, that its antiquated phraseology has a practical advantage, that the people like it as it is, that efforts to improve upon it have not been successful; that preachers and expositors prevent misapprehension, that it is so interwoven with all our associations, so copied into all books of devotion, and so multiplied in its copies, that a revised Bible would be an immense inconvenience, and that any change might shake the public faith in the book. "Let well alone," "Rest and be thankful," are the mottoes of the opposers of revision; in other words, their reasons and motives are all summed up in the one word "expediency." Notwithstanding this the demand for revision is still reiterated, and arguments in its favour, new and old, are perpetually appearing. Under the circumstances, we will avail ourselves of the present occasion to quote the concluding paragraphs of Mr. Cheyne's article. To this we will append another extract which has been forwarded us by a respected correspondent. Mr. Cheyne writes as follows, after enumerating various attempts at revision or new translation of the Old Testament in whole or in part:—

"Shall I be forgiven for saying that all these laudable essays fall short of satisfying one of the most urgent wants of the present day? We want translators to pay rather more respect than they do to the language into which they translate. Translation is, as Dr. Newman has said, 'a problem how, two languages being given, the nearest approximation may be made in the second to the expression of ideas already conveyed through the medium of the first. The problem almost starts with the assumption that something must be sacrificed, and the chief question is, what is the least sacrifice?' The writer of a translation for the people cannot hesitate long for an answer. He must devote a holocaust of particles and tenses and nice shades of meaning, if he intends his work to go out of the scholar's study and be thumbed

* *The Church of the Fathers*, Preface, p. vi.

by the daily reading of common men. His first duty is towards his own language, but in fulfilling it he really pays the highest honour to his author's. He has to represent his author's thought as clearly and intelligibly as the author would have done in the translator's language. If he makes a psalm or a prophecy appear smoother to his reader than it appeared to himself as a student, it is because he knows that there was a time when psalmist and prophet sounded as smoothly to the Hebrew ear, as now, thanks to their translator, they read to the English eye. He knows that psalm and prophecy are not only sacred, but classical; beneath a theology he has learned to find a literature.

"Thus, according to the simile of Tickell, a translation is like the unrolling of embroidery, which reveals its hidden beauties; and for the revelation of the Hebrew beauties, no language is so well adapted as the English. No language accommodates itself so well to the simple *naïve* constructions of the Hebrew. No language, unless to some extent the Italian, possesses that majestic rhythmical cadence which answers so well to the rhythmical system of the Hebrew accents. No language has enshrined in the popular Bible such a store of dignified and yet elegant words to express the tenderest emotions of the kindled heart.

"The English translator, however, needs to be continually on his guard against the abuse of these advantages. There is a large excess of Hebraism in the Authorised Version, which drew forth strong words of blame from Selden in his *Table Talk*. He says:—'There is no book so translated as the Bible for the purpose. If I translate a French book into English, I turn it into English phrase, not into French-English. *Il fait froid*, I say, 'tis cold, not it makes cold; but the Bible is rather translated into English words than into English phrase. The Hebraisms are kept, and the phrase of that language is kept. As for example' [here he quotes from memory]. 'This is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it; but when it comes among the common people, Lord! what gear do they make of it!'^b

"Perhaps the historian of literature might find some ground for mitigating this rather harsh verdict. Of those two counter movements, the Latinizing one of Milton and the Hebraizing one of the translators, the latter has turned out incalculably the more fruitful. Many Hebraisms, unknown in the language before, became household words through the English Bible.^c But from a critical point of view, Selden's judgment is fully justified. The only excuse which can be made for the translators lies in the fact that they were not seldom profoundly ignorant what the Hebraisms meant.

"The same fault in a still higher degree is chargeable upon the Vulgate; and St. Augustine relates a remarkable story in point. 'He was preaching on a certain occasion on Matt. xi. 25, which the vulgar Latin renders, *I confess to thee, O Father*, etc., and he had no sooner read the first words of his text, than his hearers fell a beating of their

^b This quotation is often made, but generally mutilated.

^c See the *Spectator*, No. 405; and compare Renan, *Job*, Préface, p. ii., "*La langue française est puritaine; on ne fait pas de conditions avec elle.*"

breasts, according to the custom of those that confessed their sins in his time; which gave him occasion to blame them for having taken too much notice of the words, without considering their meaning; telling them they were words of thanksgiving in this place, being expressed by our Blessed Saviour, who had never sinned, and consequently had no need of confession.*

"Instances, not indeed so flagrant, but still to be deplored, may easily be cited from the Authorized Version. Few people are aware how commonly they occur, and how far they interfere with the due apprehension of the meaning. The poetical books are full of them.

"Mistakes of this and every other kind may be prevented by bearing in mind the true relation of the modern translator to the original text. That relation is one of fidelity not to the parts so much as to the whole, not to the letter so much as to the spirit. Why have our revisers so conspicuously failed in the poetical books? Because they have revised them in parts instead of revising them as wholes. If, for instance, instead of revising a psalm verse by verse, they had set themselves first of all to catch the thread which connects the ideas, and then to ingraft that upon the Authorized Version, taking care to express the symmetry of the thoughts by the symmetry of the form, they would have produced a rendering faulty perhaps in details, but yet rhythmical, uniform, and intelligible.

"If, still further, they had extended their criticism from the whole to the parts, resting the eye alternately on the Hebrew and the old English, altering where alteration was needed, but compelling their alterations to assume a concordant, rhythmical form, they would have succeeded in producing a translation as near as our age can hope to see to that with which the great translators, if they had possessed our means, would have been eager to endow us.

"Perhaps some one may object that such a description implies qualities which cannot be found united in the same person. There is a very general prejudice against Hebrew scholars as dry, tasteless, hypercritical, and it must be admitted that this has too often been justified by facts. But now, when the breath of the modern *renaissance*, warm with sentiment and clear with science, has vivified even the dull domain of Hebrew grammar and lexicography, there must be something very stony in the minds of English scholars if they should still fail to exhibit traces of its influence. Renan and Bunsen, whatever be their failings, are Hebraists of equal taste and learning: why should our own nation, foremost even now in taste and scholarship, be without such Hebraists of her own?"

* *An Essay for a New Translation*, etc. By H. R. [Hugh Ross], a Minister of the Church of England, p. 45. This book is said to be really a translation from the French of Le Cène.

* The late honoured John Keble, in his metrical version of the Psalms, has shewn both taste and scholarship, but he fails entirely to give an idea of the Psalms as wholes. Still, for realizing the deep beauty of expression in them, the English reader can never possess a greater treasure than this almost forgotten book.

"The future is in our own hands, and much of its weal or woe depends on the way in which we handle our English Bible. If we handle it wisely and well, the most happy effects will be felt in all the regions of our spiritual life. Cries of failure and despondency will cease to be heard around us. Men will cease to complain of our sermons for their emptiness, their dulness, and want of reality. They will cease to complain of our people for their indifference and hostility to religious truth. They will cease to complain of our critics for their intemperate attacks on our most sacred beliefs. But attacks will always be dangerous, and defences will always be feeble, and sermons will always be dull, and hearers will always be unimpressed, until we have before us a translation of our sacred books, so clear, distinct, intelligible, that 'he may run who reads it.'"

The other extract is from Le Cène's Essay for a new translation of the Bible (translated by Hugh Ross, second edition, London, 1727).

"Chap. IV.—*Of the fate of those that have hitherto attempted to better the common translations.*—The providence of God has from the very first ages of Christianity raised up to his Church learned men who have applied themselves to correct the faults of the original, and the translations of the Holy Bible. Origen became famous in the East for this kind of study; and St. Jerome followed his example in the West, correcting the Latin Bibles that were then in use; and Pope Damasus, who knew his learning, engaged him to revise the Latin version of the Gospels, which was then in a pitiful condition. This undertaking seemed bold, and above the capacity of a private person, who could not, without incurring the envy and hatred of a great many, take the freedom to censure books universally approved and received.

"In effect, though this work was not only useful but also absolutely necessary, yet it was dangerous to attempt the reforming of errors which length of time had in a manner authorized. 'Tis a pious labour,' says St. Jerome, 'but 'tis likewise a dangerous presumption, that he who should be judged by every one should take upon him to be every one's judge, to change the language of the ancients, and bring back the world, already grown old, to the first lessons of children. For what person soever, whether ignorant or knowing, that takes this book, and finds it differ from that which he learned, will not instantly cry out that I am guilty of forgery and sacrilege in having dared to add to the sacred writings, and to change and correct them?'

"Nevertheless, seeing himself supported by a Pope, and being besides persuaded that the Latin versions which were then read in the West were very defective, he chose rather to expose himself to the calumnies of the ignorant multitude, and to pass for an innovator and for a forger, than to be wanting to his duty.

"As this enterprise of St. Jerome's was bold, and as he was not only contented to give a new translation of the Bible, but also often takes notice of the faults of the Septuagint, several opposed themselves to his design. St. Austin, who did not approve of a new translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, and believed that *that* of the Seventy

was immediately inspired, thought it impossible that St. Jerome^f should have better success than the translators that went before him; and signified to him how much he was astonished at his undertaking. Nay, farther, he used all his endeavours to take him off from it, and prohibited the use of his version in all his diocese.

"Ruffinus^g went much further, and accused St. Jerome of having scandalized the whole Church by attempting to introduce Judaism into it; of having entirely changed the Scriptures, and acting as a Jew and apostate in his translation. In fine, the matter went so far, that St. Jerome was obliged to soften his style, and after he had called his censurers 'dogs and asses,' to write apologies in defence of so useful and necessary an innovation.

"He^h complains that he should have been accused for the good service he thought to have rendered to his countrymen, *by endeavouring to encourage them to instruct themselves in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*; telling them withal, that even the Greeks, though they had the version of the LXX., made no scruple to translate his (Jerome's) Latin version into their tongue: and, if we may believe Genebrard,ⁱ Sophronius had translated it into Greek.

"He was charged above all with endeavouring to discredit the version of the Seventy, which all Christians had in great esteem and veneration. To which he often answers: 'that he had no mind to lessen its authority, and that he acknowledged it to be divine.' 'I am forced,' says he, 'in every book of the Scriptures to answer to the calumnies of my adversaries, who accuse my version as being a censure of the Septuagint. Be it known to my dogs, that I have undertaken this work for the instruction of the people, without any design of blaming the ancient version.' And, in another place: 'This work is indeed dangerous, and exposed to the barkings of my calumniators, who allege that I bring in my translation, in place of the ancient, with no other design than to blame the Septuagint. How, then, do I condemn the ancient translators? By no means; but I labour in the house of the Lord, treading in the footsteps of those that went before me.'

"But notwithstanding all these protestations, St. Austen, who was otherwise his friend, disapproved his undertaking, endeavoured to take him off of it, and would never allow to have his version read in his diocese, as has been observed already.

"But he was no sooner dead as Serrarius,^k Walton, and others observe, than his translation acquired authority, and was received by the most part of the Latins, who acknowledged its faithfulness and conformity to the original Hebrew; yet so as the ancient version was also kept to the time of *Gregory the Great*, who in his studies made use of both, as he himself tells in the end of a letter directed to Leander;

^f Epist. ad Hieron., 10, 19, 86.

^g Invect., l. 2.

^h Ep. ad Marcellin., l. 2, in Ruff.

ⁱ Chron. lib. 2.

^j Præf. in Job: Prol. Galeat.

^k Appar., p. 155, 6.

though he prefers St. Jerome's version to the ancient, declaring that it was more exact, and that whatsoever it taught was to be believed.

"This translation prevailed at length by degrees, rather by a tacit consent of the Latin Church than by any decree of Councils or Popes. For though *Hugo de St. Victor*¹ affirms that the Latin Church did authorize the reading and public use of it, yet he cites no decree to that purpose; and *Erasmus*² challenges Dorpius to produce any Synodical Act wherein it was approved; though Anselm, Bernard, and others, cite and explain it in their writings.

"*Santes Pagninus* having imitated St. Jerome by giving a translation of the Bible from the Hebrew, in the middle of the sixteenth century, met almost with the same reproaches from *Mariana* the Jesuit, and from *Genebrard*, though the Popes *Leo X.*, *Adrian VI.*, and *Clement VII.* had backed it with their authority.

"Nor did *Erasmus* meet with better treatment upon the account of his version of the New Testament according to the Greek, from *Martin Dorpius* at Louvain, from *Edward Leigh*, an Englishman, from *James Stunica*, a Spaniard, and from *Peter Suter*, a divine of Paris, notwithstanding it had the approbation of Pope *Leo X.*, and that it had escaped the censure even of the Spanish Inquisitors.

"The translations of *Junius* and *Tremellius*, and *Beza*, were no better received at first, in several places. Our English divines prohibited the selling of the former, unless their censure thereof was bound in with it: which bore that it was not to be looked upon as an exact version but as a paraphrase; and that the annotations on it were to pass only for the opinions of men, where there were several things not to be approved. This censure passed at London in the year 1598. *Beza's* version had much the same fate: In fine, every one knows how the Archbishop of Paris and the Jesuits proceeded against the gentlemen of the Port Royal for having dared to publish a version of the New Testament according to the Greek, in the year 1667.

"Nevertheless, justice has been done at length to all those versions; and it has been acknowledged that the amendments and alterations which they have made according to the original, were not only useful, but also absolutely necessary; which gives ground to hope that it would still be acceptable to endeavour to give a more exact translation of the Bible than any that has hitherto appeared. And, indeed, it were to be wished that those who are in power did employ men of true learning and solid piety, free from bigotry and blind zeal, in so noble and necessary a work."—F. J. C.

A Ride Round Jerusalem.—Living in Jerusalem, one fine October morning, the chaplain of the English church, who is something of an archæologist, and who espouses what is called the Protestant theory with regard to the Holy Sepulchre, proposed that we should join a party who were about to undertake a ride round the walls of the city. This kind

¹ L. de Script.

² Ep. ad Dorp.

offer we joyfully accepted; the more readily since, among the number of equestrians, were Mr. L., who has published his views on the holy sites, and the chaplain of her Majesty's ship "Mars," whose acquaintance we had made at Beyrout, and who had lately arrived from Jaffa with a party of middies and three sailors, the latter anxious to be baptized at Jerusalem, as they had never before been admitted into the fold of the Anglican Church. The middies and sailors accompanied us, so that we formed a numerous cavalcade, and also a merry one; for the jolly tars, being unaccustomed to "get on board" of a horse, found that, when doubled-up by short Turkish stirrups, their "sea legs" were of no avail; so they rolled about in a "groggy" manner, especially when we got fairly "under way" in a brisk gallop; and the horses being equally unaccustomed to be ridden in a seaman-like manner, or to be steered by means of the rudder, did their best to rid themselves of their unusual burdens. Thus the mutual efforts of horses and men to right one another added not a little to the general mirthfulness of the party, the sailors enjoying the fun most of all. Going out through the Jaffa gate, we turned to the north, skirting the walls as far as the corner where stood the tower Psephinus. The exact position of this tower, which was so important a feature in the siege by Titus, is disputed. Within the walls at this point there are the crumbling ruins of an octagonal tower, built of stone and brickwork intermingled. It is just possible that this may have been the lofty Psephinus from the summit of which the besieger looked down upon the besieged city beneath him. Passing between the Old and New Jerusalem, at the north-west corner, we continued to follow the line of the Damascus gate, which is the most ornamented of any in the city. It consists of a wide entrance, surmounted by a flat arch, relieved by a pointed arch above, between two flanking towers. All that is visible is of Saracenic workmanship. The gate was rebuilt in 1542, and is surmounted by battlements of the displeasing form common to buildings of that style and period. The foundations are, however, of a much earlier period, and go far to prove that the present was the original line of wall. At this point we diverged to the north, passing amidst a grove of olive-trees which spring out of the otherwise barren soil, on the north side of the city, in the direction of the tombs of the kings. These sepulchres might easily be passed without being observed, as they are situated at the bottom of a sort of quarry. They are about three quarters of a mile from the gate. Upon descending into the quarry, which is really a square chamber, cut regularly in the rock, an opening of considerable width is seen in the west face. It is decorated by a Roman Doric cornice and frieze. There were formerly two columns, evidently for ornament and not for support, beneath this entablature, but they have long since disappeared. The maiden's hair fern grows in great luxuriance on the face of the rock, wreathing the sculpture, and breaking the long straight line of the cornice, and thereby adding to the picturesque beauty of the spot. On entering we found ourselves in a chamber 39ft. by 18ft., and from it we entered other smaller chambers, with *loculi* and stone benches for the

reception of bodies. The entrance was closed by a stone, which was rolled into its place in a simple and ingenious manner. Le Brun, who was here in 1695, gives the following description of the tombs:—"We enter first by an arcade cut in the rock, and find ourselves in a large square chamber of moderate height, the walls of which are formed by the rock itself. On the left hand we see a gallery sustained by several columns, which is ornamented in many places by foliage cut in the rock. At the end of the gallery there is an opening which can be passed only by stooping. By it we enter a large square chamber, which has several small doorways leading to five or six other rooms. . . . In these chambers the bodies were placed upon tables 2ft. or 3ft. high, cut in the rock." He counted fifty *loculi*. The number of bodies which evidently were placed here shew that this was not, as some maintain, the sepulchre of Helen, queen of the Adiabene. In Le Brun's time it was believed to be the tomb of King Manasses, Amram his son, and Josias his grandson; but this is an erroneous theory, as the decoration is late Roman, while Josias flourished in the year 600 B.C. M. de Saulcy removed a sarcophagus from this place, and with great difficulty transported it to the coast. It is now placed in the Louvre, and passes for a specimen of early Jewish art, though probably it is of the date of the Roman period. By some writers on the topography of Jerusalem it is maintained that these are the Royal Caverns mentioned by Josephus; they, assuming that it was impossible that the walls, as they stand at present, even with the addition of Mount Zion *extra muros*, and Mount Ophel, could not have contained the immense population quoted by Josephus as 100,000, assert that the third wall—that of Herod Agrippa—inclosed all the ground between this spot and the city, and that these are the Royal Caverns by which it passed. There are many objections to this theory; first, the fact that traces of an old, probably a third wall are found at the Damascus gate; secondly, these tombs would not have been called caverns; thirdly, the caverns themselves exist in the line of the third wall; fourthly, there are signs of this extensive district having been built upon. There are no traces of the line of the wall itself; nor are there any of those fragments of pottery which we have invariably remarked even on the sites of cities that had ceased to exist long before the date of the siege of Jerusalem. Crossing the upper part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, somewhere near the spot where it was filled up by Titus in order to facilitate his approach to the walls, we mounted the sides of Mount Scopus, where was placed the first camp of the Emperor, and whence he had a complete view of the city, and could easily perceive the weakest points in its fortifications. From this point we galloped along the ridge to the summit of the Mount of Olives, where tradition fixes the site of the Ascension of our Lord. The Empress Helena built a church here, which, after undergoing certain vicissitudes, was rebuilt by the Crusaders. It was like the Dome of the Rock, octagonal in plan. The outer walls of the octagon have been destroyed, and the bases of columns at the angles alone remain to mark its original size; but in the centre is a small octagonal structure, with columns at the angles,

which, from their capitals and mouldings, are evidently thirteenth century work. It is surmounted by a dome of the Mahometan period. This, too, like the Dome of the Rock, is built over a stone, upon the upper surface of which are rude impressions of feet, believed by the superstitious to be those of our Saviour, made at the moment of the ascension. This stone is an object of veneration to Christians and Mahometans alike, and the former are actually allowed to perform mass within the building on Ascension-day—this being the only Mahometan shrine in existence in which such a privilege is granted. The sheikh who has charge of the mosque conducted us into the gallery of a small minaret attached to the building, from which we enjoyed a panorama which, for interest and also for a sort of wild beauty, and for rich colouring, is unequalled in the world. At our feet lay the steep slope of the mountain, dotted with gnarled olive-trees, whose foliage, agitated by the breeze, shewed that silver shimmer which is peculiar to them. Amidst them a square plot, surrounded by white walls, and full of flowering shrubs, marked the position of the garden of Gethsemane. At the foot of a mountain lay the long straight Valley of Jehoshaphat, which, on the left hand, narrowed to a ravine—actually paved with the tombstones of generations of the tribes of Israel who came to lay their bones in their beloved city. Immediately in front of us, beyond the valley, on the summit of a ridge, ran the east wall of the Haram inclosure, with the walled-up Golden Gateway conspicuously prominent, and St. Stephen's gate beyond. We looked down into the inclosure, containing the green Dome of the Rock, of elegant form, and the long Mosque of the Aksah, and could see the Mahometans walking about amongst the trees, or performing their devotions at the kohbbets. The city beyond sloped down towards us, so that, amid the mass of white flat-topped houses, we could distinguish the dome and tower of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the English church, and the immense Armenian convent in its neighbourhood; while, beyond, we caught a glimpse of the citadel and the town of David. On the right our range of vision was bounded by the rugged sides of Scopus and of the mountain upon the side of which Jerusalem stands; while, on our left, looking over the desolate Hill of Evil Counsel, we saw a wild and barren tract of country trending down to the south-east, and beyond it the light-blue water of the Dead Sea, and the Valley of the Jordan, both bounded by a wall of jagged mountain of a delicate rose purple. These were the mountains of Moab, from which Moses beheld the Land of Promise—that on which we stood—then rich and fertile, now stony, barren, burnt-up, and destitute of trees. From the Mount of Olives we rode to Bethany, where we visited the tomb of Lazarus, which is not like the usual tomb in the rock, but is several feet below the surface of the ground, and is reached by a steep staircase. There are no architectural features about it by which its date can be ascertained; but it is one of the least authenticated of the holy sites. Returning to Jerusalem, we wound round the foot of the Mount of Olives, and descended into the Valley of Jehoshaphat, passing by the tomb of the Virgin, which is situated exactly in the centre of it. This is a subter-

raneean church, without an internal feature of interest, but possessing an external door of the thirteenth century Gothic, and in very good style. Ascending the rather steep bridle-path which leads to St. Stephen's gate, we fortunately entered it before sunset, at which time it is closed.
—*The Builder.*

A Day's Ride South from Jerusalem.—There is one remarkable peculiarity in the Bible, as a revelation of God's will to man—or rather of the many books which make up the one which we call the Bible—that it is a record of historical events, extending over thousands of years, all of which occurred in many different places, but situated within a very small territory. Accordingly there is hardly a hill or valley, stream, or fountain, town or village in Palestine, which has not been the home of some person, or the scene of some event known and familiar to the Church of Christ. Every spot is consecrated by holy associations. And so in journeying through the land, we almost every hour visit some sacred locality. Thus, for example, in one day's ride south from Jerusalem, after leaving the city by the old Jewish tower at the gate of Jaffa, we cross the plain of Rephaidim, pass close to the tomb of Rachel, visit Bethlehem, drink at the pools of Solomon, stand on the plain of Mamre and by the well of Abraham, wind among the vineyards of Echol, and end with Hebron. This was our day's ride, and let me tell the reader something of what we saw in so brief a journey. As to the general aspect of the country, it is, beyond doubt, the least picturesque in Palestine, and, apart from associations, does not possess any attractive feature. The hills which cluster over this upland plateau are like straw beehives, or rather, let me say, like those boy's tops which are made to spin by a string wound round them—peeries, as they are called in Scotland—but turned upside down, the grooves for the string representing the encircling ledges of the limestone strata, and the peg a ruined tower on the summit. Imagine numbers of such hills placed side by side, with a narrow deep hollow between them filled with soil, their declivities a series of bare shelves of grey rock—the rough path worming its way round about, up and down, with here and there broader intervals of flat land, and here and there the hillsides covered with shrubs and dwarf oaks—and you will have some idea of the nature of the country between Jerusalem and Hebron. In some places, as about Bethlehem, there are olive plantations and signs of rapid improvement, with which my brother was much struck, as contrasted with what he saw on his visit seven years ago. To me the scene had a friendly and home look, for many parts of the stony road, with its break-down fences, reminded me of spots in a Highland parish endeared by touching recollections of an early home; but the grander features of “the parish” could not be traced in Southern Palestine. Yet it is obvious, as has been remarked by every traveller, that an industrious population could very soon transform these barren hills into terraces rich with “corn and wine.” Were these limestone ledges once more provided with walls, to prevent the soil being washed down into the valley by the

rain floods; and were fresh soil carried up from the hollows, where it must lie fathoms deep, magnificent crops would very soon be produced. It is well known also how soon the moisture of the climate would be affected by the restoration of the orchards. And when we remember the small quantity of carbonaceous food that is required to maintain life in such a climate as Palestine, it is obvious that a population larger than that of Scotland, living as the Easterns do, could be supported in "The Land." There was always one redeeming feature of the road, and that was "the glory in the grass." The flowers gave colour and life to the path wherever they could grow. We came upon a large land tortoise crawling among them, the only specimen we met with in Palestine. Rachel's Tomb was to me very touching. It was just where it should have been:—"They journeyed from Bethel, and there was but a little way to come to Ephrah. And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrah, which is Bethlehem." That place of burial is an undying witness to the oneness of our human hearts and of our domestic sorrows from the beginning of the world. It is this felt unity of our fate in soul and spirit, in spite of some differences in the body, whether it be in the shape of the foot or of the skull, which strengthens our faith in the possibility of eternal fellowship among all kindreds and nations and tongues. To Rachel with her dying breath naming her boy "the child of sorrow," every parent's heart will respond through all time.—*Good Words.*

The Infancy of Christianity.—To speak briefly, the explanation of the early growth of Christianity offered to us in this volume [Renan's *Apôtres*] is as follows:—The world of that age was in a state of solution; old religions were dying out, national distinctions were melting away. The idea of a human kind was beginning to occupy the void left by the ancient devotion to a country, and at the same time human nature was craving some new bonds, closer and tenderer than that of being subjects together of imperial Rome. A religion of the poor, monotheistic, knowing nothing of distinctions of country or race, thinking only of drawing out human love and assuaging human misery, met the precise demand of the time, and satisfied all its humane instincts. Christianity was a great social movement of the people and for the people. In the eye of the modern philosopher the Christian religion is terribly encumbered by its clinging supernaturalism; but in the age of its rise this adjunct offended almost no one. Every one then believed in the supernatural; the decay of the pagan religions had rather stimulated than deadened the appetite for the marvellous. The dogmas and legends of the new religion were therefore no hindrance to the victorious career of its persuasive morality. If we Christians cannot accept this explanation as satisfactory, in what form shall we most simply state our objection to it? We may reply, The supernaturalism for which you apologise, as the local or temporary garb in which the religion of humanity presented itself to a credulous age, we take to have been the living principle of the new faith. We bring no reproach against searching historical In-

quiries; we have as good a reason as you have to study with interest all the facts which illustrate the preparation of the world for the Gospel. Still less are we jealous of any praise that may be given to the warm moral life of the earliest Christian society—except, indeed, when it is eulogised as radically anti-national, or as properly breeding a servile temper, or as impulsively producing social creations which could only end in disaster and ruin. But we believe that what told most powerfully in favour of the Christian preaching, winning for it attention at the beginning, and going on to sustain the faith and life of those who received it, was its claim to be a *Gospel from heaven*. This is what appears on the face of our documents. The idea of a Divine Gospel, it cannot be denied, runs through every recorded address, every extant letter, of the apostles of Christ. The most unsparing application of the critical pruning-knife to the New Testament literature does not make this idea less prominent. Take the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians. It would be idle to ask whether the announcement of a Gospel is not the beginning and the end of St. Paul's profession. But what is it that he dreads and assails as trenching upon the evangelical principle? No scepticism as to the fact of Jesus being the Son of God exalted to the Father's right hand, but an intolerant Jewish resolve to fasten the observance of their law as Divine upon the Gentiles. All the apostles equally were witnesses of Jesus and the resurrection. They had no doubt whatever that the success of their preaching was due to the fact of their proclaiming a Saviour from heaven. There were men in the world, even in the first century, wise enough to think this announcement folly. But the apostles did not speculate upon what was enlightened and philosophical; they felt what was powerful to save. "After that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of their proclamation to save those who believed." You speak of what the world was hungering after; you tell us what conjunction of circumstances conspired to make its spiritual craving keen and general. But did mankind hunger for anything so much as for an assurance that the world was not the sport of chance or the creation of a self-evolving force, but that there was a God in heaven who cared for his human creatures, that righteousness and love were seated on the invisible throne? The Hellenic, the Ausonian, the Syrian divinities had fallen or were falling from the sky; were the poor people of that age likely to be as content as a modern Pantheist with an utterly vacant heaven? M. Renan himself tells us—it is one of the points of his history—that during the epoch of the Empire there was a scientific decline accompanying a moral progress. He finds an evidence of the decline in the fact that Marcus Aurelius, a man morally superior to all the old Greek philosophers, had notions as to the realities of the universe inferior to those of Aristotle and Epicurus; "for he believes at times in the gods as in limited and distinct persons, in dreams and presages." We contend, therefore, that, according to simple historical truth, it was the announcement of a self-manifesting God, of a God who made himself known through limita-

tions, that wrought most powerfully as a Gospel upon the conscience of the world. In the early part of his book M. Renan partially recognises this fact. There, the Resurrection, or the belief in it, is "le dogme générateur du Christianisme." It is the dream of Mary of Magdala, which has given consolation to humanity. She and her companions are the noble women who have created the faith of the world. M. Renan says with great truth—"Jesus himself had but one dogma, his Divine Sonship and the Divinity of his mission. The whole creed of the primitive Church is contained in one line—Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God. This belief rested on a peremptory argument, the fact of the Resurrection, of which the disciples gave themselves out as witnesses" (p. 91). But presently he forgets the power of these idealistic imaginations, that "charm" on which he has dilated with so much fervour. Why does he not attribute the success of a Barnabas and a Saul, in part at least, to this dear dream that the eternal God had actually spoken to men, that He was actually working amongst them, instead of delighting to represent the first believers as merely poor creatures who huddled together for warmth out of the cold of an ungenial world? Let him be sure Christians could never do without this dream. The belief in it may have been a proof of weakness, but it was their strength and life. So it has been down the ages. Genuine Christianity has not been a socialism based upon the infinite sweetness of loving, but the conviction that God has sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world.—J. LL. DAVIES, in the *Contemporary Review*.

The Vatican Manuscript.—A friend in Rome writes :—"A curious tale and one of interest to the literary world is the following. Professor Tischendorf, who discovered some time since what is known as the 'Codex Sinaiticus,' was sent here by the Emperor of Russia to collate it with the 'Codex Vaticanus.' The latter was published by Cardinal Mai many years ago; but the professor, it is said, discovered such grave errors in it that he was anxious to correct them. On his arrival in Rome no rupture had taken place in the diplomatic relations between the two governments; and on his being presented to the Pope, he obtained personally permission to examine the 'Codex.' For some mornings he went to the Vatican and pursued his labours; but at last he was informed, of course very courteously, that the permission had been suspended. Since then he has been endeavouring to obtain the revocation of the prohibition; but up to the present moment I am not aware that he has obtained it. Several years have elapsed since the University of Oxford sent to request three photograph copies, of the size of the original, of the following passages of the 'Codex Vaticanus':—B. Cod. Vat. No. 1209, p. 1276, Matt. xxvii. 52—xxviii. 10, inclusive;—B. Cod. Vat. (Apec.) No. 2066, olim Basiliani, No. 105, p. 259, Ap. i. 1; a. ii., 2.' The request was promptly and decidedly refused. The question suggests itself, if there is nothing to conceal, why refuse?—still more strongly, if Cardinal Mai published a correct copy of the Codex, why refuse a copy of portions of a MS. which in its

entirely was supposed to be already before the world? It remains with those who hold the treasure to answer it."

We copy the foregoing from the *Athenæum* of April 7. In its issue for June 2, the same journal reports progress as follows:—"A Correspondent of the *Augsburg Gazette* says, with reference to Professor Tischendorf: It is easy to understand that Hofrath Tischendorf's stay at Rome raised great expectations with regard to the 'Codex Vaticanus.' When he, twenty-three years ago, after having completed the publication of the Paris Bible palimpsest (called after the name of Ephremsyrus), came to Rome to begin the edition of the 'Codex Vaticanus,' Cardinal Mai had been busy with this very task for fifteen years. But all that Tischendorf could obtain from the personal interest of Gregory XVI, consisted in the use for a few hours of the widely-famed manuscript. For ten years the work of Mai, published after his death only by Vercellone, has been in the hand of the learned. But criticism, particularly in Germany, has pronounced unfavourably on its merits, not only because it is planned badly, but because it has created doubts as to the correctness of the reading of the text. The want is therefore felt of a new edition adequate to the present standard of palæography and criticism. A better man than Constantine Tischendorf for such a work could hardly be found; this is perfectly well known at Rome; but here, as everywhere else, narrow-mindedness reigns supreme, opposing the publication of the celebrated Roman Bible by a *giant* not Roman. Tischendorf, shortly after his arrival, was kindly received by the Pope, to whom he openly communicated his intention. The Pope answered evasively at first, but declared at last he himself intended to publish such an edition, which should vie with the imperial edition of the 'Codex Sinaiticus.' In fact, the order for this work was issued a few weeks since; but the difficulty whom to intrust with the task has not been solved as yet. Tischendorf's advice and assistance have been desired, nay, the very types which he had made for the 'Codex Sinaiticus' are to do service for the Roman Codex, and Tischendorf is said to have conditionally consented to such an arrangement. To us it seems unpardonable that such a competent scholar is not secured for this important work, and that thus the chance is lost of having a real scientific edition brought out. What great difficulties the exact reading of this most ancient manuscript offers is best shewn by the revision of the two Mai editions of the New Testament, which Tischendorf has executed during his present stay at Rome, notwithstanding many impediments."

Another Rosetta Stone.—The Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna has received the following important communication from Dr. Benisch and Dr. E. Robert Rösler, two gentlemen now travelling in Egypt. It gives fuller particulars of a discovery already briefly noticed in the papers: "In the course of our wanderings in the eastern part of the Delta and the Isthmus, in company with Messrs. Lepsius and Weidenbach, we reached San (the site of the celebrated Tunis, and the scene

of the architectural activity of Rameses II.) on the 15th of April. During our various explorations in this place, we discovered a stone, more than half buried in the ground; revealing a Greek inscription, which we forthwith caused to be dug out. What a pleasant surprise! The stone contained an inscription in two languages; and is perhaps the most important discovery since the year 1799, when the celebrated "Stone of Rosetta" was found, which gave the key for deciphering the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics. The present stone was incised in the time of the third Ptolemy, Euergetes I., 258 b.c., and contains thirty-seven hieroglyphical and seventy-six Greek lines. Its size is 2 mètres 22 cents, by 78 cents (equal to 7 ft. 3 in. by 2 ft. 6 in. English). Messrs. Lepsius and Weidenbach took a careful tracing on paper of both inscriptions, whilst we made partial copies; but so impressed were we with the importance of this discovery that we again returned to Sane on the 20th April. We remained two days, made fresh and very careful copies and another tracing, besides having the stone photographed three times. We hope to forward to the Imperial Academy an exact copy of these inscriptions by next mail, when we shall probably have succeeded in clearly deciphering the meaning of both.—*The Builder*.

The Victoria Institute, or Philosophical Society of Great Britain, recently established for the purpose of prosecuting scientific investigations in the spirit of submission to Divine revelation, has just held its first general meeting. A most able paper was read by the Rev. Walter Mitchell, formerly lecturer on natural history at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, which was directed mainly against Mr. Huxley, Mr. Tyndall, Mr. Darwin, and other notabilities of the same school. Lord Shaftesbury presided at a dinner which was held subsequently, and made a speech remarkable for its good sense. He said "science, after all, was as open to criticism as anything else; it was in a perpetual state of development; that which was a fact to-day was not a fact to-morrow. What was wanted was a free trade in science. Let this Society be a refuge for all the Cassandras of science—of those men who were never believed, although they always spoke the truth. He could not help saying that revealed religion had sometimes suffered as much from its defenders as its foes. Often when Christian men heard of a bone, or a flint, or the tail of a jackdaw being picked up on the seashore; they were so nervously sensitive that they tried to distort revelation to meet the facts of the discovery. It might turn out that the bone was not a bone, nor the flint a flint, but the reflection remained that revelation was twisted about to meet every new discovery, and that science was the great thing to which religion was to be pressed." From the Report just printed, we take the following extract:—"Your committee beg leave to advert very briefly to the origin of the Victoria Institute. On May 24th, 1855, a printed circular, which has now been in every member's hands, was sent to the newspapers and distributed to various individuals, proposing to found a new Philosophical Society, for the purpose of defending Revealed Truth from unwarranted attacks made upon it in

the name of science. The response to this appeal was so hearty and immediate, that the author of the circular and the friends with whom he had previously consulted were induced, so early as the 10th of June, to issue a second circular, addressed to those who had signified their approval of the founding of the proposed Society, or, their desire to co-operate in its formation, requesting them to attend a preliminary meeting on June 16th, to consult together as to the basis upon which the new Society should be founded. At this meeting the Earl of Shaftesbury presided; and certain resolutions having been agreed to respecting the objects of the new Society, they were referred to a sub-committee, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Robinson Thornton, the Rev. Alex. De la Mare, Captain Fishbourne, R.N., C.B., Captain Francis, W. H. Petrie, and Mr. Reddie (with power to add to their number); who were desired to report thereon, and on other matters, to a subsequent meeting, which was held on Thursday, June 22nd. At this meeting the objects of the Society, terms of membership, etc., as recommended by the committee, were agreed upon, and the result was made known in a printed circular (No. 4) dated July, 1865, inviting vice-patrons, members, and associates to join the Society for the purposes and upon the terms therein set forth. On the 1st of this month 158 members had joined, and twenty-one associates, making 179 in all, including one vice-patron, five life-members, and one second-class life associate. Since that date ten new members and three associates have joined, making a total of 192 members and associates."

Prester John.—The *Athenæum* contains an account of this famous personage, in a notice of an old French tract, — *Recherches Curieuses des Mesures du Monde*. By S. C. de V. Paris, 1626. 8vo. (pp. 48.) The writer of the notice, Professor de Morgan, says, "Many persons have heard of Prester John, and have a very indistinct idea of him. I give all that is said about him, since the recent discussions about the Nile may give an interest to the old notions of geography:— 'Le grand Prestre Jean, qui est le quatriesme en rang, est Empereur d'Ethiopie, et des Abyssins, et se vante d'estre issu de la race de David, comme estant descendu de la Royne de Saba, Royne d'Ethiopie, laquelle estant venue en Hierusalem pour voir la sagesse de Salomon, entifron l'an du monde 2952, s'en retourna grosse d'un fils qu'ils nomment Moylech, duquel ils disent estre descendus en ligne directe. Et ainsi il se glorifie d'estre le plus ancien Monarque de la terre, disant que son Empire a duré plus de trois mil ans, ce que nul autre Empire ne peut dire. Aussi met-il en ses tiltres ce qui s'ensuit: Nous, N. Souverain en mes Royaumes, uniquement aymé de Dieu, colonne de la foy, sorty de la race de Juda; etc. Les limites de cet Empire touchent à la mer Rouge, et aux montaignes d'Azuma vers l'Orient, et du costé de l'Occident, il est borné du fleuve du Nil, qui le separe de la Nubie, vers le Septentrion il a l'Egypte, et au Midy les Royaumes de Congo, et de Mozambique, sa longueur contenant quarante degré, qui font mille vingt cinq lieues, et ce depuis Congo, ou Mozambique qui sont au Midy, jusqu'en Egypte qui est au

Septentrion, et sa largeur contenant depuis le Nil qui est à l'Occident, jusqu'aux montagnes d'Azuma, qui sont à l'Orient, sept cens vingt cinq lieues, qui font vingt neuf degrez. Cét Empire a sous soy trente grandes Prouinces, sçavoir, Medra, Gaga, Alchy, Cédalon, Mantro, Finazam, Barnaquez, Ambiam, Fungy, Angoté, Cigremaon, Gorga Cafatez, Zastanla, Zeth, Barly, Belangana, Tygra, Gorgany, Barganaza, d'Ancut, Dargaly Ambiacatina, Caracogly, Amara. Maon (*sic*), Guegiera, Bally, Dobora et Macheda. Toutes ces Prouinces cy dessus sont situees iustement sous la ligne equinoxiale, entres les Tropiques de Capricorne, et de Cancer. Mais elles s'approchent de nostre Tropicque, de deux cens cinquante lieues plus qu'elles ne font de l'autre Tropicque. Ce mot de Prestre Jean signifie grand Seigneur; et n'est pas Prestre comme plusieurs pense, il a esté tousiours Chrestien, mais souuent Schismatique : maintenant il est Catholique, et reconnoist le Pape pour Souuerain Pontife. J'ay veu quelqu'un des ses Euesques, estant en Hierusalem, avec lequel j'ay conféré souuent par le moyen de nostre trucheman : il estoit d'un port gracie, et serieux, succür (*sic*) en son parler, mais subtil à merueilles en tout ce qu'il disoit. Il prenoit grand plaisir au recit que je luy faisais de nos belles ceremonies, et de la grauite de nos Prelats en leurs habits Pontificaux, et autres choses que je laisse pour dire, que l'Ethiopien est ioyeux et gaillard, ne ressemblant en rien à la saleté du Tartare; ny à l'affreux regard du miserable Arabe, mais ils sont fins et cauteleux, et ne se fient en personne, soupçonneux à merueilles, et fort deuotieux, ils ne sont du tout noirs comme l'on croit, i'entens parler de ceux qui ne sont pas sous la ligne Equinoxiale, ny trop proches d'icelle, car ceux qui sont dessous sont les Mores que nous voyons." It will be observed that the author speaks of his conversation with an Ethiopian bishop, about that bishop's sovereign. Something must have passed between the two which satisfied the writer that the bishop acknowledged his own sovereign under some title answering to Prester John."

MSS. in Italy.—Signor Francesco Trinchera, superintendent of the archives of Naples, has lately published a collection of Greek MSS., which, up to the present time, have remained hidden in the archives of Naples and of the monasteries of Monte Cassino, Cava, and other monastic buildings. This work is published in one volume 4to, and is entitled—*Syllabus Græcarum membranarum quæ partim Neapoli in majori tabulario et primaria Bibliotheca, partim in Cassinensi Cænobio ac Cavensi et in Episcopali Tabulario Neritino jamdiu delitescerent, in lucem prodeunt, etc.* In the first part, entitled "Prolegomeni," Signor Trinchera, beginning with the Hellenic origin of the many cities and towns of the Southern Provinces, sketches a brief history of "Grecesmo" under the Romans; under the dominion of the Goths, under the Emperors of Byzantium; and successively under the Norman, Swabian and Angiovin kings; concluding with a report of the researches and labours which he and the learned men connected with him in the archives of Naples have made in order to collect and explain the MSS. of which this syllabus is composed. The second part contains no fewer than 352 Greek MSS. (with

a Latin translation) from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries. Lastly, the third part is composed of the reproduction in *facsimile* of numerous extracts from these MSS., with the signatures and seals of the times; and a complete index of names of words and things treated of in the MSS. Under the innumerable details which these documents supply of private civil and religious life in the middle ages is brought to light a phase hitherto unexplored of that mixed society of Greek and Italian, Roman and barbarian, Catholic and Byzantine. It is a reproduction of the habits and forms of this every-day life of the generations which have preceded us.

Flora of the Dead Sea.—I think a few facts relative to the Botany of the Dead Sea Valley will not be uninteresting to your readers, as they have peculiar importance in determining the geological changes which have produced the depression of the surface of the salt lake. The southern extremity of the Dead Sea Valley is remarkable for the existence of two very distinct floras—one of a luxuriant and the other of an exceedingly arid and sparse character. The former of these exists in the oasis of Es Saffieh and Edgedi, and consists chiefly of trees and shrubs, especially *Moringa aptera*, *Salvadora Persica*, *Calotropis procera*, and *Acacia segat*, and has a decidedly Nubian type. The latter is a continuation of the desert flora of Arabia Petrea, Suag, and Northern Africa, which reaches its northern limit at the same boundary of the great wadies at the south of the Dead Sea. (The Nubian or luxuriant flora of Edgedi and Es Saffieh alone concerns us in this inquiry before us, since the occurrence of the latter, of desert flora, although its boundary is defined by very abrupt limits, is easily explained by the present physical characters of the stratum, setting it as one continuous tract through Arabia Petrea and Suag. The occurrence, however, of Red Sea and Nubian forms, which require much water for their growth in luxuriant profusion, in two small isolated oases, which do not together cover twenty square miles, is a remarkable fact, and can only be explained by supposing a continuity of basis to have existed formerly between the Red Sea and Dead Sea Basin. The fauna, especially the bird fauna, of these oases and that at Jericho bears this out equally strongly; the existence of that very local bird *Catopis chalcus* in these oases, and also of such tropical forms as *Cinixis* and *Ixus* in Palestine, point to the same conclusion that the whole Wady Arabah was within the period of the existing flora and fauna a fertile oasis. I think M. Lartet has shown very conclusively that the Jordan never found its way through the Arabah into the Red Sea, and that the former higher level of the salt lake was due to a greater rainfall than takes place in Palestine at present, which is certainly borne out by the remarkable depth of the water-worn wadies, and especially by the vast river courses which traverse the desert plateaux of Beersheba which take their rise in the high land about Hebron, and have evidently been dry since the time of Abraham. If this greater rainfall accounts for the existence of Nubian forms in Palestine, the climate could not

have been very much colder than it is at present. The greater elevation of the mountains of northern Palestine, Mount Hermon, and Anti-lebanon, by increasing the volume of the Jordan, would have been quite sufficient in all probability to account for the former higher level of the surface of the Dead Sea, which probably more than doubled its present extent, so greatly increasing the surface for evaporation. This would probably have increased the rainfall to an extent that would not only explain the deep wadies and the water-courses of the desert of Beer-sheba, but would also have rendered the Arabah fertile along the course of streams flowing from its water-shed into the salt lake to the north, and into the Red Sea to the south. This hypothesis seems to me to explain all the phenomena, and also to agree in the main with that advanced by M. Lartet.—BENJAMIN T. LOWRE.—*The Reader*.

French Mission in Syria.—The following report by M. E. G. Rey, to the Minister of Public Instruction, has just been published in Paris: "In the month of August, 1864, I was charged by your Excellency with a scientific mission in the north of Syria. The principal object of my mission, besides the study of the military movements of the Crusaders, was the correction of the geography and archaeology of the mountains of the Ansariés and of the regions lying in the pachalic of Aleppo, on the right bank of the Orontes, and between that river and the Euphrates. The mountains of the Ansariés—known in ancient times under the names of Mounts Bargylus, and which separate the basin of the Orontes from the littoral of the Mediterranean—are yet little known. In the beginning of the present century the Emperor Napoléon sent Col. Boutin to explore them; but he was assassinated in the year 1812. Since that time few travellers have penetrated into these mysterious valleys, which, however, were pointed out by the eminent geographer, Karl Ritter, for research. Barukhardt was the first to traverse the southern extremity of the mountains, and to throw some light on the topography of a portion of these countries. Between the years 1848 and 1852, the American missionaries, Eli Smith and Thompson, and afterwards Lyde, traversed these mountains with a view to the establishment of a Protestant mission and schools; but their efforts were hopeless. Eli Smith alone collected geographical notes of great interest, which he communicated to Karl Ritter. In consequence, however, of the death of their author, these notes seem to have been lost for ever to science. Some itineraries of the Rev. Mr. Thompson, published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, supplied us with the first serious information respecting the districts of Safita and El Hoss. These regions were also visited by Lieut. Walpole; but, unfortunately, his notes, like those of Mr. Lyde, do not furnish exact notions relative to the configuration of the country. In the month of May, 1861, Mr. Waddington traversed the southern extremity of the spur of these mountains, on his way from Kalaat el Hoss to Massiad, and visited the villages of Safita and Kartouman. In the following year the Comte de Vogué went from Kalaat el Hoss across the district of Safita to

Tortosa. Lastly, one document alone furnished me with precise notions of the country—but unfortunately only of the coast—namely, the English hydrographic chart published in 1862.

"I arrived in Syria at the end of the month of August, 1864, at the moment that the Duc de Luynes had completed his remarkable exploration of the Dead Sea, and I found at Beyrouth his companion, Léont Vignes, who was about to set off for the purpose of rectifying the astronomical determination of Palmyra and of a series of points in the valley of the Orontes. This officer and I determined to carry on our geographical labours in connection with each other, and before separating we measured a triangle near Tripoli to serve as point of departure. On the 15th of September we quitted Tripoli, and in a few hours crossed two rivers—first, the Nahar el Bared, at the point where Orthosia stood, and afterwards the Nahar el Kebir. On the following day we separated—M. Vignes going towards Homs by Kalaat el Hesi, and I towards the north. On the same day I traversed the great plain which stretches between the mountains of Akkar, the last range of the Lebanon; and during the following days I passed through the cantons of Châra, El Hosi, and Saïta, where I attained the culminating point of the chain of the Ansariés, at an altitude of about 2,200 metres. It was in the midst of these mountains that I found, in the locality of Hosi Souleiman, the ruins of the temples of Jupiter, which had only been mentioned by Liott, Walpole, and whose scientific importance was yet unknown. The first thing that strikes the eye in descending towards the site of the ancient Bactocete is a vast enclosure, 144 metres long and 90 metres wide; the figure is irregular, and approaches the trapezium, so that its plan resembles that of Harâm es Sherif at Jerusalem. It is the best-preserved specimen of sacred enclosure. It is constructed of blocks measuring from 6 to 9 metres in length, 2.85 to 2.90 in height, and, on an average, from 98 centimètres to 1.10 mètre in thickness. There are four entrances to the enclosure. On one of the piers of that which faces the north-east may be read two inscriptions: the first, in Greek, recounts the donations made to the temple by a King of Seleucis; the second, in Latin, the restoration of its revenues during the Roman period. In the middle of the enclosure rises a temple of the Ionic order, which seems never to have been completely finished; and in front of the peristyle is an altar, which probably was formerly covered with bronze. Towards the north-west exists another group of edifices, which the people of the country call El Deir, or the Monastery. It consists of a small temple, apparently of a good period, and of an imposing structure, in which, perhaps, the priests of Jupiter were accustomed to assemble. On the same occasion I had the opportunity of visiting again the remains of a sanctuary of more recent date at Naous, near Tripoli; it consists of two temples, with a *tholos*, still in a good state of preservation. Here, as at Hosi Souleiman, I found the walls formed of gigantic blocks, with courses of masonry beneath, which agreed with the ordinary dimensions of classic architecture. The same fact was observed by M. Joyau in the ruins of

Balbec. I think it right to remark this rare peculiarity, which appears in three different places, evidently with systematic regularity. I thought it my duty to give several days to the examination of these interesting ruins. I therefore left the site of Hossn Souleiman, and, descending towards the south, I followed the ridge of the chain, and visited the spring known as Nahar es Sabte; this is the Sabbatical stream mentioned both by Pliny and Josephus, and on the banks of which Titus rested on his way to Antioch after the siege of Jerusalem. Afterwards, in making my way towards Hamath, I saw the ruins of Baarin, the *Mons Ferrandus* of the Crusaders—the site of Raphaneo—and the celebrated castle of Massiad, the ancient residence of the Dail-Kebir, or Grand Prior of the Batenites of Syria. Hamath having been thoroughly studied by my learned predecessor and friend, Mr. Waddington, I only stayed a few days in that place, whence I went to examine the ruins of Selmeih, on the right bank of the Orontes, and found there several Coptic inscriptions, full of interest, and dating from the early years of the Hegira. Selmeih presents the peculiarity of having been built by Mussulmans on the site of a Byzantine city, which is supposed to have been Irenopolis. I also studied the ruins of the castle of Schoumaïmis, which Kemal Eddin-Abou Hafs-Omar, the historian of Aleppo, says was rebuilt by Melik Moudjahid. I then proceeded to Aleppo by Marrah and Sermin, by a road which has not yet been mapped. In visiting the ruins of Areyneh I gained the site of Membedj, the ancient Hierapolis, situated in a rocky plain, about six miles from the Euphrates. Here stood the temple in which, according to Lucian, the rites mentioned in his treatise, *De Deâ Syriâ*, were solemnized. On reaching the centre of these ruins one is struck at once with the topography of the sanctuaries, as described by the Greek author. To the west of the city may still be seen, half dried up, the lake in which the sacred fish were kept. It was on its banks that took place the ceremony of the descent of the lake of which Lucian gives such a curious account. A little further on is the hill on which stood the temple; the orientation of its chief axis is north, with a quarter west. Unfortunately, nothing remains of the building, unless it be some shapeless fragments mingled with the Arab constructions of the Middle Age which surround it. The hill and the sacred lake alone recall, with a certain exactness, the places described by the Greek writer. The monuments of the ancient Hierapolis disappeared to furnish materials for the constructions of the Lower Empire, whose work, in its turn, was displaced for the edifices of the Mussulman conquerors. Nevertheless, I was able to obtain a certain number of Arab inscriptions, which are not without interest; and I was fortunate enough to find in the midst of the ruins of the temple a stela in lava, representing the Goddess of Syria seated on a throne, supported by two lions, and conforming in all respects to the description given by Lucian. Returning again to Aleppo, I proceeded to Latakieh to explore the northern part of the mountains of the Ansariés. Taking the course of the Nahar er Sahioun, one of the principal affluents of the Nahar el Kebir of Latakieh, I traversed suc-

cessively the cantons of Sahioun, Kerdaha, and Mahelbeh, where I visited the ruins of the castle of that name; but they present nothing but a mass of rubbish belonging to the Christian middle age and the Arab period. Then descending again to Jebel, where I desired to make some geodesical observations, we regained the mountains to visit the cantons of Aleika and Kadmous, inhabited during the Middle Ages by the Batanites of Syria. The aspect of this portion of the country is very wild, the sides of the valleys forming almost impracticable precipices. The hills were formerly wooded, but the coppices have recently been burnt, and the white ashes may be seen here and there. A few large evergreen oaks, despoiled of their foliage and half carbonized, still stand erect. These recent and extensive traces of fire in the midst of the abrupt gorges add to the wild desolation of the scene. No buildings are to be seen but a few miserable huts inhabited by Ansariés and Ishmaélites, as wild and as picturesque as the rocks by which they are surrounded. In the midst of these rocks are the ruins of the castles of Aleika and Kadmous. The former is almost entirely destroyed, and its remains present no archaeological interest; and of the latter scarcely a vestige remains, Ibrahim Pacha having blown it up during his campaign against the Ansariés in 1836. The modern village of Kadmous is inhabited almost exclusively by Ishmaélites. From the last named place I ascended the Djebel Naby Schit, one of the highest points of this portion of the mountains. Thence I proceeded to Tortosa, passing by Markab, the Margat of the Knights Hospitallers, the last possession of the Christians in Syria, and which only fell in 1287. The strong places possessed in the Middle Ages by the Crusaders in this part of Syria were connected with each other by small towers or stations, all built after a uniform plan, and a great number of which exist still. They present, on a small scale, all the features of the donjon, are invariably square, and composed of two vaulted stories, which were subdivided by wooden planks, a system which I had before observed in the donjon of Djebail. In the middle of the lower floor is the opening of a cistern. These towers, which could have had but a small garrison, assured communication between the castles, and answered the purpose of block houses in modern warfare. Of all these castles none possessed the importance of Tortosa. This fortress, which had a double enceinte of walls and deep fosses filled by the sea, stands at the north-west angle of the site once occupied by the town. The height of the inner wall allowed the defenders, who occupied the double crenellated line which crowned it, to aid those on the outer wall in case of attack. The whole of both walls is flanked with square towers. In the centre of the reduct rose all the accessories of a grand fortress of the Middle Ages—chapel, donjon, grand salle or château, etc. The donjon, of which the base still exists, is apparently that which is described by Wilbrand of Oldenburg and Jacques de Vitry, under the title *Turris Antaradis*. My various excursions having occupied me till the 13th of December, and the rainy season setting in, I was compelled to take up my winter quarters at Beyrouth. —*Athenæum*.

On the Adaptation of the Roman Alphabet to Foreign Languages.—[The following article is from the *Printers' Register* for May 5. The important question of which it treats is viewed in a very practical way, and the opinions advanced appear deserving of the careful consideration of all who are interested in the subject. Every intelligent endeavour to facilitate the simple, ready, and correct representation of Oriental and other foreign alphabets by means of European characters should be welcomed at the present time, and therefore we have pleasure in calling attention to the following remarks.—ED. J. S. L.]—If any practical printer will carefully study the work of Professor Lepsius on a *Standard Alphabet*,* he will be convinced of two things. The first is, that the system therein laid down seems one of remarkable perfection, from a philological point of view, since it establishes a full and self-consistent series of symbols for all the sounds the human voice can produce; and the second is, that considered as an attempt to adapt these symbols to letterpress printing, it is as utter a failure as could possibly have been devised. For every new type added to the case lessens the facility with which the composition can be effected; and Professor Lepsius adds to a single fount of Roman and Italic a total of more than six hundred and fifty additional "sorts." That is, they amount to about 170 special accents and diacritical marks, placed over, or under, the ordinary alphabet; and as nearly the whole of these would require separate punches for the upper as well as the lower case of both Roman and Italic, even if we omit small capitals, we must multiply almost every sign by four for the complete fount. But as no office could be adapted to the varied requirements of commercial as well as of book printing without a variety of founts, of different bodies and faces, the confusion becomes worse confounded, and the mind is perfectly bewildered in estimating the total of the hooks and crooks and moons and arrowheads that would have to be added to a printing-office "laid in" with the founts of Professor Lepsius. And yet it is to this incredibly awkward typographical system that a number of Missionary Societies have given their approval and support; especially the Church Missionary Society, which enforces the adoption of it at all its stations. The only ground on which this can be accounted for is, we venture to say, that the managers of these Associations are not printers; for if they had been, they would no more have adopted an alphabet which piles three several accents on one letter, than they would have gone back to the Egyptian hieroglyphics!

In many other matters besides the representation of sound, it is necessary to compromise between what is theoretically perfect, and what is practically attainable; whilst a neglect of this entails nothing but failure in the matters we propose to accomplish.

Now let us lay down two facts needful to be borne in mind by those who are not practical printers:—

- I. That whilst in writing, and, consequently, in lithography, there is no difficulty in placing diacritical signs over or under a letter, yet in letterpress printing every such marked type necessitates either

* *Standard Alphabet for Reducing Unwritten Languages and Foreign Graphic Systems to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters*, London: Williams and Norgate.

a letter cut on purpose, or else the accent has to be "justified" in a separate line, at a great expenditure of time and trouble, and at a greatly increased liability to error at press.

XL. That, on the contrary, whilst in writing it is rather less easy to append separate marks at the *side* of the letters, yet in letterpress printing marks of any kind are readily so placed.

Remember, we are not denying the *possibility* of printing with multiplied accents, any more than we deny the possibility of using moveable letter to print Chinese. But the practicability of everything is in the inverse ratio of its difficulty; and its general adoption depends, not merely on whether it *can* be done, but on the degree of ease with which it may be accomplished.

It is on this ground that we believe Professor Max Müller's proposition to be the best—viz., to work with the tools already in our hands, instead of adding to them, not merely six-hundred-fold, but ten-thousand-fold. For if letterpress is to be in India and China all that it is at this moment in this country and France—and less than all this we ought not to make calculation for—an immense variety of sizes and patterns of the Roman alphabet will be required, every one of which, as well as all the book-founts, will have to be supplied with the new accents.

Before turning from the inconveniences of adopting Lepsius's system, let us add one or two others;—

First, that as speed and accuracy of "composition" depends much on the clearness of the copy put into the printer's hands, rapidly written MSS., containing such complicated accounts as these

[illegible]

must necessarily largely increase the chances of error.

Second: so many marks crowded on to the line dazzle the eye of the reader to such a degree that the use of the smaller sizes of type is precluded; and thus a still further restriction is created to the employment of typographic printing.

Third: from the necessity for space above the capitals for the diacritical marks, a large "beard" must be left at the top for this purpose; and thus the size of the face is seriously diminished in proportion to the body, thereby further diminishing the legibility of the type.

On the other hand, we are aware that Professor Max Müller's system is open to some objections, such as the want of beauty in a page worked with a mixture of Roman, Italic, and small caps; the difficulty of distinguishing some of the latter from lower case of the same sort; and the difficulty of setting up words in *capitals only*, seeing that the latter arrangement would obliterate some of the distinctions provided for by using small caps.

With regard to the first of these objections, it is true that as compared with ordinary Roman print, the mixture of Roman and Italic contrasts unfavourably; but much of this effect is owing merely to habit of sight. We must not forget, however, that the question really is, not whether

Roman looks better than Italic and Roman mixed, but whether the latter will bear comparison with its rival, the *accented* page. Here we have no hesitation in saying the balance is clearly on the side of the Italics; for anything more offensive to the eye than the bristling array of spikes and jags which crowds some of the works of the Church Missionary Society cannot be conceived. The only thing to which we can compare a line of it is a wall set with broken bottles!

With regard to the other objection, it must be borne in mind that although Professor Max Müller recommends small capitals, he has no objection to the substitution of antiques, or other distinctive types, in their places, if required. His *principle* is simply this: if there are in a given language three varieties of sound of the same class—such as three n's for instance—he uses the ordinary n for the one corresponding with our English n; another face n for the second; and still another face N for the third. The reason he prefers Italics and small caps is that they are the sorts the most generally to be met with.*

A plan adopted by Professor Wilson to secure this distinction, and still partially adhered to in printing oriental tongues with Roman letter, is the placing of *dots* under the modified types—using one, two, three, or four, as the case may be. Speaking of this mode Max Müller says:—“This is by far the most systematic plan that has as yet been proposed, because it is far easier to remember the different degrees of modification, the first, the second, the third, etc., according to the number of dots, than to recall the hidden powers of accents, lines, hooks, crooks, half-moons, etc., which have no meaning in themselves, and which different people would adopt for different purposes. . . . There is, however, a grave objection to this, and any other plan which requires types not supplied by a common English fount. It is useless for a Missionary who in a remote station has to print translations, or tracts, and prayers, and has nothing but a small fount at his disposal.”†

Now we have a very simple suggestion to offer for the consideration of printers who are placed in the circumstances mentioned by Professor Max Müller—and that is, that whilst the dotted types just mentioned are open to the vital objection of having to be cast on purpose, yet if the dots were placed *alongside* instead of *below* the letter, the *full-points* of every ordinary fount would supply the required addition, and answer sufficiently all the purposes of special accents; besides which they would place *at the command of the foreign printer the use of every existing fount, of every size, not only of Roman and Italic, but of Sanserif, Antique, and Ornamental Type, even including the large wood letter used for posters.*

Suppose, for example, we wished to transliterate the Sanskrit alphabet into the *Roman Capital* letters, we should proceed thus—first remarking that it would be much easier for an oriental to *begin* learning capitals *only*, than capitals and lower case together, inasmuch as the latter is almost as bad as acquiring a knowledge of *two* alphabets at once.

* *Proposals for a Missionary Alphabet.* London: Williams and Norgate.

† *Missionary Alphabet*, pp. 40, 42.

K KH G GH N
C C·H J J·H N
T T·H D D·H N
T TH D DH N

P PH B BH M
Y R L V [or W]
S S: S

Nasal Sign, or Anuswa-ra, M·

Final Aspirate, or Visarga, H·

Vowels— A A· I I· U U· R· R: LR· LR: E E· AI· O AU

Here no consonant is dotted, except to mark a departure from the European pronunciation—and such departures are dotted in the order in which they occur in the native, or “Devana’gari” alphabet. Thus, the first N· is the English *ng* in *sing*; the second is more like *n* in *kinge*; the third is a hollow sound made in the roof of the mouth; whilst the fourth is the ordinary English N.

The vowels are dotted to mark the *long* sounds. As to the R· R: LR· and LR: they are sounded with an I, which might be added, if preferred; but in this case the dot should read at the foot of the letter, instead of at the top, to avoid mistaking the last letter for the long I.—[thus, RI. RI.]

To enable the reader to judge the effect *en masse*, we append a short specimen printed on this plan in Sanserif. Any practical printer will readily see that the mode is equally applicable to any other ornamental fount, and that, for large or display letter it would only be needful to use much smaller full-points than those belonging to the fount itself.

HITOPADES·A

ASTI MAGADHA-DES·E C·AMPKAVATI· NA·MA·RAN·YANI·—TASYA·M· C·IRA·N
MAHATA· SNEHENA MR·GA·KA·KAU NIVASATAH·—SA C·A MR·GAH· SWEC·C·
HAYA· BRA·MYAN MR·S·Y·A·PUS·T·AN·GAH·, KENAC·IT SR·GA·LENA·VALO·
KITAH·—

Or in lower-case thus :

Asti Magadha-des·e C·ampkavati· na·ma·ran·yani· — Tasya·m· c·ira·n
mahata· snehena mri·ga·ka·kau nivasatah·—Sa c·a mri·gah· swec·c·haya·
bra·myan hri·s·t·a·pus·tan·gah·, kenac·it ari·ga·lena·valokitah·—

Every consonant in the native Sanscrit alphabet (unless modified) carries with it an inherent short *a*, so that this short *a* does not require to be added in writing. Therefore कन (KN) spells *kana*, but if it is required

to write *kan*, a small stroke, called Virama, is placed under the न (N) to shew that the vowel is to be suppressed. When, on the other hand, two or more consonants are required to coalesce, they are combined into one character: thus स sa य ya combine into स्य *sya*.²

If the missionary printer wished, in any initiatory works designed to familiarise natives with the Roman alphabet, to make the transition as easy as possible, it might not be amiss, in addition to confining himself to sanserif capitals (as the simplest form of Roman) to group these in imitation of the Sanskrit compound letters, by the insertion of thin spaces, somewhat in this manner:—HRI· S: TA PU S:TA· NGAH·—by which

² This necessity for combined letters obliges a fount of Sanskrit to run up to 650 sorts!

the passage from one system of literation to the other would be so evident, that an intelligent man ought to master it in a few hours at farthest.

In selecting Sanskrit, to shew the application of this mode of using Roman type, we would remark that very few other languages would require so many "modified" sorts—and even in this we have gone to the extreme limit in using them for such letters as C and J, which represent the *Ch* in *Chess* and the *J* in *Judge*, respectively. The chief objection to using the *Ch* or the *J*, is that they do not convey to all *Europeans* the same sound.

Space forbids our continuing this paper to a greater length, or we would give a specimen of Zulu, using the full-points for the Kafir "clicks," and of a Chinese dialect, employing them for "tone" marks to shew how wide a range can be compassed in letterpress printing by a very simple expedient. There is no doubt that, *in time*, most diacritical marks, whether accents or dots, will disappear in writing from every language. Something like Darwin's "natural selection" must operate here, however, since those distinctions which are vital to the grammatical structure will be retained, whilst less important refinements will gradually die out.

Palestine Exploration Fund.—Since our last issue several notices of the important expedition sustained by this fund have been published. We insert these notices below, as they have a permanent value, and now that the first series of labours is completed, we shall hope to review the results.

Fourth Report.—Capt. Wilson writes, under date of Feb. 20, 1866: "We have now reached Nazareth, and in continuation of my last I send a few notes of what we have been doing lately. *Topography.*—Anderson has made astronomical observations fixing the positions of Khan Minyeh, Mejdal, Tiberias, Kefr Argib (near north end of Lake), Wady Fik, Alma, Kefr-Birim, Meiron, Alebbon, and Nazareth, and has added considerably to the map we are making. I can hardly describe this part of the work, so inclose a small tracing from Van de Velde's map, shewing in color the district which has been reconnoitred and plotted, on a scale of one inch to a mile, since we reached Banias. We have not, of course, been able to fill in all the small details, which would require the extended operations of a regular survey; but this will give with great exactitude the main features of the country. The greatest error found in the existing maps is in the course of the Wady running into the plain of Gennesareth, the great bend of Wady Selameh, shewn by Van de Velde as forming portion of Wady Amud, being really a continuation of Wady Rubadiyeh. We were disappointed at not being able to take our mules round the Lake, and thoroughly explore the eastern side; the Governor of Tiberias, who appears to be at open war with the Bedouin, refusing to give us an escort, and without this our muleteers would not cross the Jordan; we, however, hired a boat at Tiberias, and landing at the mouth of the Jordan, made a three days' walking excursion, during which we were able to examine the country to about half a mile below Wady Fik, when the weather compelled us to return to Tiberias, and it was hardly considered worth while to start on another excursion to explore the small

remaining portion, the character of which we could see from our last point. It would take too long now to send you a full description of this part of the country; but I may mention that there is only one place, about half way between Wady Fik and Wady Semakh, which fulfils all the conditions required by the Biblical narrative of the destruction of the herd of swine. *Archæology*.—I think I mentioned that we had been able to trace the ancient system of irrigating the Ghuweir, and that our excavations in the mounds at Khan Minyeh had been without result, the masonry uncovered and pottery found being of comparatively modern date. Some excavations were made at Irbid, and detail plans and drawings made of the building there, which is an old synagogue, but has suffered a good deal by having been at one time converted into a mosque. The caverns Kalat Ibn Maan were explored, and found to have been at one time used as a convent. At Tiberias the ruins of the old town occupy a larger area than we had been led to expect, and we traced an old aqueduct which supplied the town with water to its course some miles off in the hills. At the north end of the Lake, Et-Tel was visited; the ruins there are small, and no traces of architectural detail could be found amongst them. On the plain we visited several old sites; one, near the northern edge, to which no name could be obtained, had a portion of the city wall standing; and a few basaltic fragments of architraves and cornices, one with a well-executed scroll of vine-leaves and grapes; on the shore we found some ruins called Kefr Argib (perhaps the Argob of the Bible?), they are of some extent, but contain nothing remarkable; at the mouth of Wady Semakh are some ruins called Kherish, much of the same character as those at Kefr Argib; at Kalat el-Husn (Gaurah) are numerous capitals and fragments; but no distinct plan of any building could be made out. The line of the entire street can still be plainly traced. Being so near Um Keis we took a holiday one day and paid it a flying visit; one peculiar feature which I have not seen noticed before is the enormous number of sarcophagi, all of basalt, and ranged side by side in two rows, which one of the main roads leading eastwards passes. From Tiberias we turned north again, to complete the examination of the Jarinuk district, and at some ruins called Nebartain discovered an old synagogue, on the lintel of which was an inscription in Hebrew, and over it a representation of the candlestick with seven branches, similar to the well-known one on Titus's Arch at Rome—a squeeze was taken of the inscription; at Kasyun the ruins of a small temple were found, and a mutilated Greek inscription; at Kefr Birim some small excavations were made to disclose the plans of the two synagogues, of both of which detailed plans and drawings have been made. A plan has also been made of the church at Yarun, the style of architecture of which is very peculiar, and like nothing we have seen elsewhere; the cross has been used with great freedom as an ornament, and no two capitals were found alike—on one were some curious designs, on another each face had a bust in the centre, etc. Two Greek inscriptions were found at Yarun, both mutilated. At Meiron, plans, etc., were made of the synagogue, and drawings of some of the tombs which are peculiar. At Um el Amud we found the ruins of another synagogue, and a broken slab on which are two lions.

Some fine sarcophagi, similar to the Kedes ones, were found at Shallabben. *Photographs*.—The following have been added to our list:—View of the Ghuweir from Khan Minyeh,—view of the Aqueduct at Khan Minyeh,—two views of ruins at Irbid,—view of Kurn Hattin, 'Mount of Beatitudes,'—view of Wady el Hammam,—view of ruins at Kalat al Husn (Gamala),—view of Tiberias,—view of lintel with inscription and candlestick, at Nebartain,—four views of ruins at Kefr Birim,—view of ruins at Meiron,—view of large sarcophagus at Meiron,—view of slab with lions at Um el Amud. *Meteorology*.—The three aeroids reached us safely on the 9th, the day we left Tiberias, and since then a regular series of barometrical and hygrometrical observations have been made; the aeroids have been found invaluable for filling in the relative heights of places on the reconnoissance sketch."

Fifth Report, dated Nablus, May 17th.—The following notes have been received from Capt. Wilson:—*Topography*.—The positions of Nazareth, Zerin, Lejjun, Beisan, Jenin and Nablus have been fixed astronomically, and a one-inch sketch made of the eastern portion of the plain of Esdraelon and Valley of Jezreel down to Beisan; a reconnoissance sketch of the road from Jenin to Nablus; sketches of Beisan and Sebastiyeh, on a scale of six inches to a mile; a chain survey of the summit of Gerizim, on the 1:500th scale; and a sketch of Elbal and Gerizim, with the valley between, which is now in progress. A base line has been chained for this, so that the distance between the two mountains will be obtained with the greatest accuracy. *Archæology. Excavations, etc.*—At Zerin some small excavations were made near the large square building in the village, but without result. In and around the village are more than 300 cisterns or subterranean granaries for corn; a number of these were visited at various points, in the hope that some remains of the old town might be found in them; but neither there nor in the large accumulation of rubbish round the village could any foundations, or remains be seen of sufficient importance to justify the commencement of excavations on a large scale. The examination of the mound is quite practicable, but would require some time and a large sum of money. Lejjun, Tamsuk, and other places around, were visited, and notes made on their ruins. Descending to Beisan, we were much struck with the isolated appearance of the hill on which Kurnish stands, apparently, the "hill of Morsh, in the valley" (Judges vii. 1). At Beisan we were utterly at a loss where to dig; and the disturbed state of the district made it difficult to find labourers; over the greater portion of the area the rank grass and vegetation reached nearly to the shoulders, so that the character of the foundations could not be seen; and it was only by stumbling amongst the loose hidden stones that the existence of a great portion of the ruins was detected. Most of the columns standing appear to have at one time ornamented a street which ran from the Gadara gate round the Acropolis. A plan was made of the theatre; two rock-hewn tombs and several sarcophagi were found. Whilst at Beisan a visit was made to Sukkat. The name seems to be applied to the district as well as to a small Tel, on which are some inconsiderable ruins; there is no very marked feature, such as would answer to the expression, "Valley of

Succoth;" the district is rich and well watered, and was, when visited, occupied by over 200 tents of the Sukr Bedouin, who are now at war with the Adouan. The river being unfordable, the fighting has been confined to an exchange of Arab abuse and a few long shots across the river; some four or five men have been killed. Excavations were carried on simultaneously at Sebustiyeh and Gerizim; at the former some excavations were made at the Church of St. John and two of the temples. A plan was made of the church and the grotto, which seems to be of masonry of a much older date than the church. There are six loculi in two tiers of three each, and small pigeon-holes are left at the ends for visitors to look in; the loculi are wholly of masonry. The northern side and north-west tower are of older date than the Crusades; I think early Saracenic; in the latter there is a peculiarly arched passage. The church is on the site of an old city gate, from which the "street of columns" started and ran round the hill eastwards. The old city was easily traced; plans were made of the temples; they are covered with rubbish from ten to twelve feet deep, to remove which with Arab labour would take some three or four months. Anderson took charge of the Gerizim excavations, and opened out the foundations of Justinian's Church within the castle; in many places but one or two courses of stone are left; the church is octagonal, on the eastern side an apse, on five sides small chapels, on one a door, the eighth side too much destroyed to make out, probably a sixth chapel; there was an inner octagon, and the building without the chapels must have been a miniature "Dome of the Rock." A few Roman coins were found. The southern portion of the crest has been excavated in several places, but no trace of any large foundations found; in an inclosure about four feet from the Holy Rock of the Samaritans, a great number of human remains were dug up, but nothing to tell their age or nationality; we have since filled in the place and covered them up again; the Amran says they are the bodies of those priests who were anointed with consecrated oil, but may more probably have been bodies purposely buried there to defile the temple, or rudely thrown in and covered up in time of war. An excavation was made at the "twelve stones," which appear to form portion of a massive foundation of unhewn stone. M. de Saulcy is quite right about the name of Luzah being applied to the ruins near the place where the Samaritans camp for the Passover. They are not of any great extent; by far the most important remains are on the southern slope of the peak, where a portion of the city wall can still be seen and the divisions of many of the houses. Whatever its name or date, there was certainly at one time a large town surrounding the platform on which the wely and castle now stand. *Photographs.*—View of Fountain at Nazareth,—two views of town of Nazareth,—Cliff behind Maronite Convent, Nazareth,—view of Zerin with Mount Gilboa,—two general views of ruins at Beisan,—old Roman bridge, Beisan,—theatre, Beisan,—three views of Church of St. John, Sebustiyeh,—general view of Sebustiyeh,—street of the Columns, Sebustiyeh,—ruins on Mount Gerizim from south,—sacred rock of the Samaritans,—interior of castle, with Ebal in the distance,—the twelve stones and west wall of castle,—view of ruins of Mount Ebal,—supposed scene of assembly of twelve

tribes under Joshua. *Geology*.—The only peculiarity noticed was the construction of Jebel Duhy (Little Hermon), which is composed of a conglomerate of trap fragments, flints and portions of hard limestone. The highest point where the wely stands is entirely of basalt, as is also an isolated conical-shaped hill, Tel Ajal, lying between Endur and Nein, and these appear to have been the centres of eruption for the basalt which covers the country as far as Beisan.

Capt. Wilson writes from Jerusalem, under date of April 2nd:—"Since last writing to you we have come down the country quicker than I at first intended, on account of our muleteers and servants who have left us. The topographical work has consisted in fixing the positions of Tubaz, Bedouin Camp near Jordan, Beit, Dejan, Turmus Aya, Beitin, and Jerusalem, by astronomical observations, and sketching in as much of the country as could be done on the march. The discrepancies in the position of Wady Zerka have arisen from the peculiar course the stream takes after leaving the mountains. The mouth of the Wady is nearly correct in Van de Velde, but the confluence is some four or five miles lower down near Jisr Damieh; I am not sure of the exact distance, as the work has not yet been plotted to scale, but we have the necessary material. *Archæology*.—Plans have been made of an old masonry tomb at Teyasir, and of the churches at Beitin and Bireh. Seilun and Beitin were examined with a view to excavation; at the former there is very little rubbish, except the stone walls of the deserted fellahin village, and we could not see any suitable plan for excavating; at Beitin the modern village covers the whole of the mound of rubbish. I intended to clear out the interior of what is known as Burj Beitin, but found that since last year it had been thickly planted with fig-trees, and the amount of compensation demanded was too exorbitant. I may, however, be able to come to terms before leaving Jerusalem. The following photographs have been taken:—Doorway of mosque at Nablus, two views of Nablus, tomb at Teyasir, Bedouin encampment, ruined mosque at Seilun, general view of ruins at Seilun, fountain of Seilun, general view of Beitin, two views of ruins near Beitin and two views of church at Bireh."

Mr. George Grove has received another report, dated Jerusalem, May 2nd, from Capt. C. W. Wilson, of the Royal Engineers, in charge of the

* The Palestine Exploration Committee held a meeting in April in the Jerusalem Chamber, the Archbishop of York in the chair. The results of the preliminary surveys and explorations were considered; and as it appeared to be the opinion of those present—many of whom were familiar with the Holy Land personally—that these results are encouraging, and in some respects valuable, it was resolved to make a new and enlarged appeal to the public for support. Capt. Wilson will arrive in three or four weeks; when a general report will be drawn up and a public meeting convened. Meantime it is desired that sub-committees should be formed in such towns as Dublin, Edinburgh, Manchester, Liverpool, Oxford, Cambridge, Leamington, Leeds and Brighton. A working-committee was appointed, of which the following gentlemen are members:—The Archbishop of York, the Dean of Westminster, Mr. W. Hepworth Dixon, Mr. James Fergusson, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Layard, M.P., Mr. Morrison, M.P., Mr. John Murray, Dr. William Smith, Mr. W. S. W. Vaux, and of course, Mr. George Grove, the Secretary. The head-quarters of the Committee will in future be at the Asiatic Society.—*Athenæum*, April 28th.

Expedition sent out to the Holy Land by the Palestine Exploration Fund. Astronomical Observations have been carefully continued by the explorers. At Tibneh all the tombs were opened and visited; many of the "oculi" contained great numbers of bones, and one a perfect female skeleton, which crumbled to pieces as soon as it was touched. At Abad a fragment of a Greek inscription was found, and near the village a number of rock-hewn tombs, in one of which the sides were painted; the porticoes were ornamented in a style somewhat similar to that of the tombs of kings and judges at Jerusalem. Near Kafr Saba portions of the old Roman road were discovered. At Caesarea were found portions of the outer wall, the amphitheatre, a pool, and four aqueducts; a plan was made of the Crusader's Church. At Tantura men were quarrying stones for the Jaffa market, and had opened a great portion of the mound, but no remains of a temple or other public building were visible. At Hebron the character of the Haram masonry is identical with that of the Wailing Place masonry. The low-level aqueduct beyond the Pools of Solomon secured its supply from a fine fountain in Wady Arsob; but the source of the high-level one could not be found. At Jerusalem two excavations have been made, one in front of the gate Ghinnath (so called), and the other in front of the Bab-el-Burak of the Haram; the former is finished, and shows the gateway to be of comparatively modern construction. The latter is in progress; it is fifteen feet deep, but the soil has not yet been reached. Capt. Wilson has been able to get down into the passage from this gateway, a portion of which forms the present mosque of El-Burak. After running east for a short distance, it turns sharp to the south, and ascends by a gentle incline. The masonry is very fine, apparently Herodian; the faces of the arches have the same moulding as that in the Mosque El-Burak. A descent of Jacob's Well was made. Additional excavations on Mount Gerizim show that the Castle and Church have been built on a rough masonry platform. Capt. Wilson and Mr. Anderson are about to return to England. They will reach London on June 19.

Archæology in Rome.—The establishment of an Archæological Society at Rome, set on foot by Messrs. Portnum, J. H. Parker, and other gentlemen, promises to be of great service in directing attention to the value of the old remains, as well as in assisting in the publication of memoirs which would otherwise never see the light. Mr. Parker has, during the last three winters, been much occupied with the early architecture of these remains, and has a volume on the subject nearly ready for publication. This activity on the part of foreigners has somewhat stirred the bile of some of the stand-still, obstructive gentry in power at Rome, who "could not understand why gentlemen should not be content, like other Christians, with the inside of a church; but must go poking about the outside walls and basements." By bringing historical records to bear on the existing remains, the distinct styles of building adopted, for instance, in the outer walls of the Mons Palatinus have been referred, satisfactorily, to the respective periods of their erection; thus the walls, formed of large square blocks of stone, not sawn, but brought into shape with a hammer or some such tool, and fixed without mortar,

are referred to the time of the Kings. Of this there are some grand remains of a tower deep below the Church of St. Anastasia, and it is amongst these buried ruins that the grave of Cardinal Mai has been built. So, again, the walls, of small stones arranged lozenge-wise (composed of tufa), are of the Republican period; whilst those of tufa with horizontal layers of tiles are of the latest period of the Republic; the Imperial work being entirely of brick, the bricks very thin, some at least two feet long, and beautifully arranged. Other distinctions have also been noticed. During his stay in Rome, Mr. Parker has superintended the execution of a very extensive series of photographs representing all these different styles, by an excellent artist, very well versed in Roman archaeology, of the name of Simelli.

Early Christian archaeology has also made rapid strides at Rome. Not content with the great French work of Pierret on the Catacombs, which is generally considered to give far too highly finished a character to the various wall-paintings in them, M. de Rossi has published the first volume of a great work on the Christian inscriptions, and also a first volume on the Catacombs in general. He is also the editor of a periodical devoted to the early Christian archaeology of Rome. The Rev. P. Garuzzi has prepared a third edition of his remarkable work on the painted glass objects found in the tombs; whilst the Rev. Abbé Barbier de Minitault has prepared a descriptive catalogue of all the Christian remains preserved in the Museum of the Vatican Library (where, by the by, we lately met Professor Tischendorf, busily engaged upon some early unedited MSS. of the Bible). It may be useful to some of your readers to be informed that many of the objects, which were in the Museum of the Vatican have been removed to St. John Lateran, which will in time become the great Christian Museum of Rome. Here, for instance, are placed all the grand Christian sarcophagi, as well as the Christian inscriptions (except those in the long gallery of the Vatican leading to the sculptures, in which the pagan inscriptions occupy the right and the Christian ones the left of the gallery). The collection of these inscriptions at St. John Lateran has been carefully arranged, according to their dates, by De Rossi. There is another great collection of them at St. Paul's Basilica (the restoration of which most noble church would of itself be sufficient to mark the reign of any sovereign Pontiff); these are now fixed in the galleries leading to the library. A chromo-lithographic work on the "Christian Mosaics of Rome" is in progress, the first number of which will be ready for publication, by Spithover, about the end of the present year.

The excavations at San Clemente are being continued under the direction of the excellent Prior, the Rev. P. Mallooly. Although the present basilica, which is one of the oldest in Rome, and well known for its interesting mosaics and its two marble ambones in their original position, is much below the adjoining street running from the Colosseum to St. John Lateran, an under-church of large size has been discovered, with numerous very early wall-paintings and fine marble columns. The excavation is at present being continued beneath the high altar of the upper church, which, it is feared, will have to be taken down and rebuilt. And, still deeper, a house has been discovered, which was doubtless the

precursor of the lower basilica when the Christian inhabitants were but few in number. The excavations undertaken by Mr. Parker, with the consent of the Abbess of St. Pudentiana, beneath the existing church (which, like San Clemente, is considerably below the level of the street), have been stopped by order of the superior authorities. Sufficient has, however, been found to shew that a preceding basilica extended beneath the western half of the present church, a strong wall running from below the entrance to the spot below the high altar. The original pavement or the floor of the house of Pudens has been reached and partly cleared, and we had the pleasure to observe that it is formed of minute tesserae arranged mosaic-wise, just as in the original pavement of the western aisle of the church (which also is contemporary with the time of Pudens), and also as in the pavements of Pompeii. Thus we are brought into the residence of the famous senator Pudens, so deeply interesting, not only from his connection with Caractacus and his family, but also from the fact to which Justin Martyr bore testimony, that the house of Pudens was the resort of early Christians visiting Rome, and that he himself had, on several occasions, been its inmate. The altar in this most interesting little church, on which St. Peter was traditionally affirmed to have officiated, was removed by Cardinal Wiseman (as titular cardinal of St. Pudentiana); and two very early sepulchral inscriptions to members of the family of Pudens have also been moved, by order of the present Pope, to St. John Lateran, where they are lost in the crowd of similar stones; but a stone recording the burial of another female of the Pudentian family has been found, and fixed in the west aisle, together with the grave-stone of an early bishop found on the spot, in remarkably fine and large Roman capitals.

The learned archivist of the Vatican records, Dr. Theiner, has recently published a valuable series of documents connected with the mediæval history of England and Scotland from originals under his charge, as a supplement to two or three similar volumes illustrating the history of Germany and other countries of Europe.—J. O. W.—*Athenæum*.

Royal Asiatic Society.—Jan. 15.—The Right Hon. Lord Strangford, V.P., in the chair.—A paper was read "On the Initial Coinage of Bengal," by Mr. E. Thomas. In the Protected State of Kooch Bahár, in Northern Bengal, a large hoard of silver coins was discovered towards the end of August, 1863, from which, previously to its being consigned to the Presidency Mint crucibles in Calcutta, selections were made to enrich the medal cabinets of the local mint, and the museum of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. In addition to these upwards of a thousand specimens were secured for Colonel C. S. Guthrie, and it was from a critical examination of the latter selection that the writer had derived the leading materials for his paper. The collection, he said, was remarkable for its peculiarly local character, and its extremely limited range in point of time; inasmuch as it embraced compactly the records of ten kings, ten mint cities, and represented one hundred and seven years of the annals of the country; and the date of its inhumation might be fixed towards the end of the fourteenth century A.D. The writer proceeded to shew that pre-

viously to the first entry of Muhammadan armies into Bengal, no coined money of any description was current in that province; and that it was the Emperor Altamsh whose silver coins furnished not only the prototypes of a long line of sequent Delhi mintages, but also the manifest introductory model of all Bengal coinages. After fully treating the various questions as to the artistic merits of the Bengal coins, their varying standards of weight and intrinsic value, and the relative rate of exchange of the precious metals *inter se*, under the different rulers of Muhammadan India, the author noticed, in conclusion, the historical bearings of these coins, in connection with the slender data furnished by Persian and Arabic writers of that period. Beginning with the celebrated Queen Regnant of Muhammadan India, Riziah, the daughter of Altamsh (A.H. 734), whose coins are the earliest that can be definitely attributed to a Bengal mint, the following reigns are successively represented in the series:—Rukn-ud-din Kai Kâus (A.H. 691), Shams-ud-din Firûz (A.H. 702), Shahâb-ud-din, Bahâdur Shâh (A.H. 710), Mubârak Shâh (A.H. 737), Ak Shâh (A.H. 742), Ghâzi Shâh (A.H. 751), Ilîas Shâh (A.H. 740), Sikandar Shâh (A.H. 751), and Azam Shâh (A.H. 791). The principal mintages were at the following cities, each of which served in turn as capital:—Lakhnauti (or Gaur), Firûzâbâd (or Pandur), Satgaon (near Hooghly), Shahr-i-nau (or the rebuilt Gaur), Sunârgaon (near Dacca), and Muazamâbâd (a new capital of Eastern Bengal).

Jan. 29.—Sir E. Colebrooke, Bart., M.P., President, in the chair. Messrs. E. B. Cowell and T. C. Plowden were elected resident members. —A paper by the Hon. H. E. J. Stanley was read, "On the Poetry of Mohamed Rabadan, an Arragonese Morisco." The author stated that a MS. in the British Museum containing the poems of Rabadan was bought by Mr. Morgan, H.M. Consul at Tunis, at Testûr, in the Tunis territory, in the year 1719. There were then, according to Mr. Morgan, twelve villages or towns in the province of Tunis where the people spoke Spanish, and one in which they spoke Catalan. These people knew by heart, and were in the habit of reciting the poems of Rabadan, which were written in Spanish at the beginning of the seventeenth century, for the instruction of the Moriscoes, who, even at that time, a hundred and twenty years after arriving in Africa, and living as they did in the midst of an Arab population, continued to use the Spanish language. The principal portion of these poems is a history of the prophets, beginning with the creation of the world and going on to describe the deluge, the history of Abraham, the genealogies of Ishmael and Isaac, and the history of the other prophets, down to Hashim, Abdul Muttalib, and the Prophet, the description of whose death forms one of the best cantos in the book. Among the other poems in the volume, the writer mentioned with particular praise the history of the day of judgment. In point of literary merit, he said, these poems were of no mean order, but they were equally interesting to the philologist, on account of the Arabic words scattered over them, many old Spanish words now obsolete, and various other peculiarities. The Arabic words, of which several are used, which are now lost from the Spanish language, are so defaced that it is not always easy to recognize them; they are either religious or legal terms, such as *almalague*, an

angel; *alcursi* and *alarz*, the Divine throne; *alcafara*, expiation; *acidaque*, dowry; *algnati*, a woman's legal deputy. As instances of the way in which from Arabic roots words were formed according to the rules of Spanish grammar and idiom, the writer mentioned the following: *halecar*, to create; *halecado*, creature; *halecamiento*, creation; *azachdado*, prostrated; *taharado*, purified; *alcafanado*, shrouded; *alhijantes*, pilgrims; *alhohador*, the writer of the *Alláh abmahfúd*, or heavenly prototype of the Koran.—After the reading of the paper was concluded, Viscount Strangford made some further remarks on this little known and much-neglected chapter in the literary history of Spain, viz., Spanish poetry, by Morisco authors. The number of poets and prose writers of this class was, he said, by no means so inconsiderable as one might suppose; and besides Mohamed Rabadan and Abdulkarim bin Aly Perez, there were many other authors whose works were well worth collecting and editing. There was at present one scholar, the celebrated Spanish *savant*, D. Pascual de Gayangos, who had stored up all the information on the subject to which access could be had; but, pending the preparation of his collections and his literary researches upon them for publication, it was most desirable that an edition of Rabadan's poems from the MS. in the British Museum were undertaken by a competent scholar; "a task which would involve no difficulty, as they are in the Spanish character as well as language, whereas most other MSS. are in the Arabic character and Spanish language."

February 19.—Sir E. Colebrooke, Bart., M.P., in the chair.—Mr. Maltby, Esq., presented to the Society a series of large photographic views in Tanjore and Trivady, and the photograph, twenty feet in length, of an inscription around the basement of the Vimanam of the Great Pagoda at Tanjore. The inscription dates from the beginning of the fourteenth century, A.D., and is in the old Tamil language, and of a character bearing great resemblance to the Grantha, Malayalam, and, in some letters, to the alphabet of the Gujarati Plates.—A paper by Mr. B. Norris was read, containing "introductory remarks to a specimen of an Assyrian dictionary." The author stated that while assisting Sir H. Rawlinson in the preparation of Assyrian inscriptions for publication, he had got together a very large number of words. These he had arranged in the form of a dictionary, intended "to serve, at least, as a repository in which Assyrian students may jot down their difficulties, and find a page where they may look for help by collating passages containing the words they are investigating." He proposed to commence at once the printing of the whole dictionary, if the specimen given should be thought satisfactory. After adverting to the difficulties of the Assyrian syllabary, encumbered as it is by monograms, determinatives, polyphones, unpronounceable proto-Babylonian symbols, and varying orthography, the author said he had arranged the words according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet, taking no notice of inherent unwritten vowels, or of the complementary vowels following them, which serve, at most, only to lengthen the syllable. Accad or proto-Babylonian words would be generally rendered as if they were Assyrian, and left to take their chance in that form; with the exception of a few of frequent occurrence, whose

Assyrian equivalents are well known from vocabularies and variant readings. In conclusion, he mentioned that throughout the work a normal character would be used, as near to the older Assyrian forms as the disposable typographical arrangements would admit.—The reading of the paper being concluded, Sir H. Rawlinson said he could bear testimony to the great difficulties with which Assyrian lexicography was beset on all sides, passing at the same time a high encomium on Mr. Norris for his indefatigable zeal in grappling with them; and then gave an account of the Accad element, which largely enters into the composition of the Assyrian records, and vastly increases the difficulty of deciphering them.

Syro-Egyptian Society.—Feb. 13.—B. H. Cowper, Esq., in the chair.—A communication from Dr. Hyde Clarke respecting the monument of Sesostris near Smyrna was read, the discussion upon it being postponed. A paper "On the Book of Daniel," by Samuel Sharpe, Esq., was then read. He considered all the promises as written after these events had happened, and therefore as so much history; and from those events he endeavoured to assign a date to each several portion of the book. Chapter i.—vi. contains the life of Daniel from his youth, under Nebuchadnezzar to the reign of Cyrus, king of Persia. Chapter vii. forms a second portion, which mentions Antiochus Epiphanes, and therefore must be as modern as B.C. 170; in this portion four great kingdoms are described under the figure of animals, which seem meant for Assyria, Babylon, Persia, and Greece, unlike the four kingdoms in the former portion, which were Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece. Chapter viii. forms a third portion, which again mentions Antiochus Epiphanes, and may be of the same date as the second portion. Missing Chapter ix., in Chapters x., xi., xii., we have a fourth portion, which again mentions Antiochus Epiphanes, but is rather more modern than the last, as it mentions his being recalled from his invasion of Egypt, by the tidings that Parthia and Armenia have rebelled against him. Chapter ix. is the fifth and most modern portion, containing the celebrated prophecy of seventy weeks, or 490 years, which begin with the command of Cyrus that the Jews should return home and rebuild their temple, and end with the overthrow of their king, Aristobulus, the Jewish government being changed from a monarchy to an aristocracy in the year B.C. 53; about which time, according to Mr. Sharpe, this portion of the Book of Daniel was written.

Ethnological Society.—Tuesday evening, Feb. 27th, a meeting of the Ethnological Society was held in their rooms in St. Martin's-place.—Mr. Crawford in the chair.—The first paper read was by Colonel Rigby, formerly British consul at Zanzibar, on the Somali race, who occupy an extensive territory on the north-eastern portion of Africa, between the Straits of Babel Mandeb and Cape Guardafui, and extending as far south as the equator. These people, though their skins are quite black, differ in most respects from the negroes of other parts of Africa. They are a pastoral race, and possess large herds of cattle and sheep. They are generally tall and well made, their features express much intelligence, and are of the Grecian type, with thin lips and aquiline noses, and their hair

is very thick and long. They have, indeed, none of the characteristics of the usual negro race, whom they affect to despise. The women are tall and well formed, and, when young, are very good looking. Though the people are Mohamedans the women are not secluded, but are treated as the equals of the men. The dress of the men resembles that of the old Roman costume. It consists of a white flowing robe wrapt loosely round the body, with one end thrown over the left shoulder. They are fond of wearing charms and amulets made of silver or amber. Both sexes pay great attention to their teeth, and constantly use as a tooth-brush a fibrous twig of a tree. They are bigoted Mohamedans, and in addition to the usual festivals they observe some that are supposed to be of earlier origin. The Somali are divided into various tribes independent of each other. Their arms consist of a light spear, a shield of rhinoceros hide, a long straight two-edged dagger, and a bow with poisoned arrows. The Somali language has no resemblance to the Arabic, but it is remarkable for its regular construction, especially as it has no written character. There are two genders of nouns, the plural is regularly formed from the singular; the verb has four tenses, and it is always last used in a sentence. Colonel Rigby considers the Somali an original, unmixed African race. A short discussion took place on the paper, in which Dr. Rouay, Mr. Carter-Blake, Mr. Robins, and Mr. Crawford, took part. A second paper, by Mr. Crawford, was then read, "On the origin and progress of written language," with a view to illustrate the characters of the different races of men. The first attempts of man towards making a visible record of ideas, Mr. Crawford observed, must have consisted of pictorial representations of natural objects, as the most obvious and easy method. Of this we have examples in its rudest form in the scratching on trees and roots of the savages of America, and in a more improved state in the pictorial writing of the Aztecs or Mexicans. The imperfect and untractable nature of symbolic writing must, however, have early presented itself to most nations, and accordingly two people only have persevered in it, and reduced it to a workable system—the ancient Egyptians and the Chinese, two wholly different races of man, far away from each other, and certainly ignorant of each other's existence when they adopted that clumsy and cumbrous form of writing. Vocal or phonetic writing, Mr. Crawford said, seems to have been invented as soon as such a state of society had been reached as allowed of the existence of a class that had leisure for meditation. The party that would soonest enjoy such leisure would naturally be that which had the spiritual direction of a people; and if we suppose letters to have been the invention of a priesthood, the art was in all likelihood at first confined to religious purposes, and came in time only to be extended to secular ones. It required, however, a considerable advance in civilization before a people could invent or adopt phonetic writing, and the absence of such writing among the ruder tribes of Hindostan, of the Indo-Chinese countries, and of the Malay and Philippine Islands, was adduced as an illustration. Nor had such a system of writing ever been invented by any people of America. The African negro, who, possessed for ages of corn and cattle, of metals and good materials for clothing, has never invented an alphabet. Egyptians,

Numidians, Nubians, and Abyssinians, on their own continent, have invented written language, but never a negro people. We must come, therefore, Mr. Crawford said, to the conclusion that the negro is an exception, arising from a peculiar stolidity. Even in their own country it is but rarely that negroes have adopted the letters of strangers; and beyond it they have done so only when under some degree of constraint or compulsion. But by far the most remarkable instance of a people who have failed to invent either symbolic or phonetic writing is afforded by the races of Europe. No race from the Euxine to the Atlantic, or from Greece to Scandinavia, he said, has ever invented an alphabet. It may be presumed that this may have arisen from the fact that no European race had reached that point of civilization at which written language is invented before the time in which a foreign phonetic writing was presented to them and adopted. That written language was the separate and independent discovery of many different nations, seems to be proved by the difference in the forms of the characters which represent them, the differences in the sounds which the letters represent arising from the necessities of the languages for which they were originally framed, and often even the disparity of their order or arrangement. Mr. Crawford adduced numerous illustrations in support of that position, particularly among the people of the East, and in conclusion of the paper he observed—"All the letters of mediæval and modern Europe, under whatever name or of whatever modification of form, are derived from the Latin alphabet. They have no high antiquity to boast of. The forefathers of the Montaignes, of the Corneilles, and of the Voltaires, had just begun to use the Greek alphabet in the time of Julius Cæsar; but the forefathers of the Shakespeares and Miltons, of the Bacons and Newtons, whose posterity was predestined to spread over the best part of America, and the whole of Australia and the islands of New Zealand, were at the same time as illiterate as are now the negroes of Ashantee, or as were the cannibals of New Zealand when Cook first discovered them." In the discussion of the paper, Mr. T. Wright observed that Mr. Crawford had omitted to notice the Runic alphabet, which was distinct from the Greek and Roman, and had been in use in the north of Europe before either the Latin or Greek letters had been introduced.—*Morning Post*, Feb. 28th.

Antiquaries.—March 8th.—Mr. Octavius Morgan, M.P., in the chair.—The Rev. J. Simpson, Local Secretary, exhibited Roman antiquities found at Brough, in Westmoreland, and offered some remarks upon them. A short paper on the same subject was read, contributed by the Director. Mr. Lewin read his paper on the "Mosque of Omar." Eminent architects who had inspected that building had assigned to it with certainty a Roman origin, not earlier than the first year of Diocletian, A.D. 284, nor later than the period of Justinian, A.D. 527. They had even gone further, and fixed as its actual date some time in the first half of the fourth century. So far, Mr. Lewin agreed with them, but he could not follow them in the theory that it was erected by Constantine, or that it covered the real site of the Holy Sepulchre. The church built by Constantine over the Holy Sepulchre was burnt by the Persians, A.D. 615, afterwards

rebuilt, and A.D. 1009 rased to the ground by El Hakim. The Mosque of Omar therefore could not be the same building. The cave underneath the mosque is not in the centre, as it would be if it were the shrine in honour of which the whole building was erected, but is quite in the south-east corner, and it is pierced by communications leading to a well below. Mr. Lewin's theory was that the Mosque of Omar occupied the site of the Temple to Jupiter Capitolinus, founded, according to Dion Cassius, by Hadrian, A.D. 135, and that it was the actual building erected and dedicated to the same object by Maximin. It did not occupy the site of the Temple of Jerusalem, but was somewhat to the north of it. Maximin was one of the Cæsars, and the district allotted to him was Syria and Egypt, over which he ultimately took the title of Emperor. His reign lasted from A.D. 305—313, and comes within the very period fixed by the architects for the building in question. It was marked by a systematic attempt to re-establish Paganism, and he erected or rebuilt a temple in every city in his dominions. That the Mosque of Omar is the temple erected by him to his patron, Jupiter, in Jerusalem, is confirmed by the close affinity it bears to the temple of Jupiter in the palace of Diocletian, at Spalatro, built rather before A.D. 300, and now a Christian cathedral. Both are octagonal; the order of architecture in both is Corinthian; both have a crypt underneath, and are approached by a golden gate. In one respect they differ: the temple at Spalatro is surrounded by a colonnade; that at Jerusalem is enclosed with an outer wall. Vitruvius lays down a rule that across temples of this latter construction there should be a tribune of one-third the diameter; this exists in the Mosque of Omar, of the precise dimension, and explains the fact of the elevated piece of rock being suffered to remain in the centre. Mr. Lewin was not of opinion that the mosque had ever been used as a Christian church. The *Itinerary of the Bordeaux Pilgrim*, who was a contemporary of Constantine, mentions the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as just built, but used no such expression in reference to the building in question. A visitor made some remarks in confirmation of Mr. Lewin's views, and Mr. Black mentioned that he had personally investigated the dimensions of the Mosque of Omar, and found them, in every respect, true Roman measurements of the time of Hadrian.

A meeting of the Palestine Exploration Committee is called for Thursday, June 28th, to receive Capt. Wilson's report of his recent visit to Syria. The meeting, which was to be held in the Asiatic Society's rooms, was to determine on the future course of the exploring party.

The *Athenæum* says, "We hear from Smyrna (through Dr. Hyde Clarke) that Mr. Spiegelthal has made a curious discovery with respect to the great Syro-Assyrian monument called the pseudo-Sesostris. He has found on the margin of the brook, at Nymphæum, a little lower down the stream, a repetition of the colossal rock-cut sculpture, with the bow, lance, etc. The face is said to be much disfigured."





